LIPPINCOTT'S SOCIOLOGICAL SERIES

EDITED BY EDWARD CARY HAYES, PH.D., LL.D.

PROFESSOR OF SOCIOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

SOCIAL WORK IN THE LIGHT OF HISTORY

BY

STUART ALFRED QUEEN, PH.D.

PROFESSOR OF SOCIOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

16 FEB 1923

PHILADELPHIA AND LONDON
J. B. LIPPINCOTT COMPANY

1922

COPYRIGHT 1922, BY J. B. LIPPINCOTT COMPANY

PRINTED BY J. B. LIPPINCOTT COMPANY
AT THE WASHINGTON SQUARE PRESS
PHILADELPHIA, U. S. A.

EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION

ALTHOUGH much has been written upon the subject of social work, until now there has been in English no adequate presentation of the subject in the light of history. Nothing available takes the place filled by the present book of Professor Queen. It places the subject of social service in the perspective of historical development, sets forth the practical lessons of experience which the long past has enforced, and reveals the tendencies which must be understood by those who wish to participate in the next steps of progress in this department of human endeavor.

This is the first volume to appear in the Lippincott sociological series. This series is designed to present a systematic summary of the most substantial results that have been achieved in the different subdivisions of sociology. The volumes fall naturally into two divisions. The books included in the first group will be devoted to pure science, that is to the endeavor to know and understand the facts of social life, undiverted by any other aim. The books of the second group will be devoted to practical sociology, and will deal with topics which have obvious relation to welfare and progress. However, the books of the first group will set forth teachings that, in many instances, have quite as far-reaching practical importance as any which will be contained in volumes that have an obviously practical aim. And the books of the second group, though dealing with subjects which compel a practical interest, will be written in a thoroughly scientific spirit.

It is planned to include in the first group volumes upon "Social Evolution," "The Biological Factors in Social Causation," "Social Psychology," "Groups and Group

Contacts," and "Social Values and Valuations." Intermediate between the two groups will be a volume on "Social Progress" intended to set forth the more general applications of sociological knowledge. In addition to the present volume on Social Work in the Light of History, books that will fall in the second group are being prepared on important subjects, including "Sociology and Education," "Problems of Population," and "Criminology."

While the series when completed will present the logical and systematic character just described, the order of publication will depend upon the time when the different volumes are brought to completion by their authors. It is the intention to preserve the freedom of the writers to work under the conditions by which they can achieve the best results. Each book will be complete in itself, but planned with reference to all the others, so that the series as a whole will fulfill as nearly as possible the ideal of a logical summary of the product of the intellectual movement which goes by the name of sociology.

EDWARD CARY HAYES.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS.

PREFACE

In preparing the following pages for the press I have had several groups of readers in mind, especially college students and interested citizens who wish, without delving deeply into the subject, to have some definite notion as to the significance of social work. I hope to put them on the track of answers to the questions which I know they are asking, questions such as these: Just what is meant by the current phrase "social work"? Is it the same as philanthropy, charity, welfare work or uplift? Why do we have so many social agencies with their numerous employes and their constant appeals for funds? Are they really needed? What do they accomplish? Whither is all this stir about social service leading us?

It has become my conviction that the most valuable contribution toward answering these very pertinent questions could be made by an historical review. No attempt has been made to produce an original contribution to knowledge of any subdivision of history, and there has been relatively little use of original documents. Instead I have chiefly aimed to coördinate and to make available the fruits of research which are contained in such works as Lallemand, *Histoire de la Charité;* Uhlhorn, *Die Christliche Liebestätigkeit;* Clay, *Medieval Hospitals of England;* Bosanquet, *Social Work in London;* Webb, *Poor Law Policy;* Ashley, *Introduction to English Economic History;* Hayes, *Political and Social History of Modern Europe, Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work.* At the end of each chapter will be found some of the more important sources of information. Through these the careful student can check the accuracy

of most of the statements made. These short bibliographies will furnish satisfactory supplementary reading.

A distinctive feature which differs from traditional usage is the working back from the present instead of presenting a chronological narrative. In taking this course I have thought to make the historical account better serve the purpose of helping to understand contemporary social work. I hope that the book will show the possibility of relating social work to general social and economic development, illustrating the unity of the social process. It should emphasize the usefulness of history as a technique for interpreting the present and anticipating the future. And it should test the wisdom of studying history backward in the service of a particular purpose.

I am happy to state that the manuscript has been carefully reviewed by a number of representative persons who have offered valuable suggestions. I wish especially to acknowledge the advice and assistance of my present and former colleagues, Edwin H. Sutherland, Jesse F. Steiner, Harry M. Varrell and Mary P. Wheeler.

BOSTON, APRIL, 1922. STUART A. QUEEN.

INTRODUCTION

Social work has never been a static thing. It has always been growing, developing, changing; sometimes for better, sometimes for worse. But probably never before have those engaged in this field of service been so keenly aware of the fact that changes are taking place. Whether, even now, they are able to interpret the signs of the times is, of course, an open question. But surely it is worth while to try to understand what is going on, for only thus can the future be planned with intelligence.

It should be obvious that in order to understand the present and to anticipate the future we must examine the past. But before turning back into our yesterdays, it will be profitable to look about and form a tentative estimate of today. Then while studying the developments of earlier generations we shall know what to look for. Having a preliminary idea of our present status and trend, we can ask of the past these questions: Are these things new or have they been experienced before? Are they part of a movement toward some definite goal, or do they indicate a groping in the dark, or possibly mere drifting? Are the changes that have occurred such as we would denominate "progress" or are they rather retrogression?

This manner of studying history backward may seem a little unusual to some readers, but it appears to be in harmony with the spirit of the best modern historians. Indeed, an examination of their viewpoint will constitute a helpful approach to our own study.

James Harvey Robinson says of history, "The one thing that it ought to do, but has not yet effectively done, is to help us understand ourselves, and our fellows,

and the problems and prospects of mankind." If we had an adequate understanding of the past, we should be able to interpret our present and to anticipate our future, "not because the past would furnish precedents of conduct, but because our conduct would be based upon a perfect comprehension of existing conditions, founded on a perfect knowledge of the past."

Charles Seignobos urges the cultivation of more intimate relations between the historians and the social scientists. Already they have much in common both as to subject matter and method. History that is a bare recital of "facts" is limited in value as in interest. Social science that ignores the historical background of present problems can never offer effective solutions.

Karl Lamprecht emphasizes the importance of studying the experiences of large groups of people instead of centering our attention on a relatively small number of "great men." He would give a minimum of attention to incidents that are more spectacular than influential. The mere chronology of disparate events would disappear in the effort to trace a single, coherent process, in which economic, political, religious and ethical elements are inextricably interwoven.

In the spirit of these three representative historians we shall undertake to trace the developments which are taking place in social work. Among the developments to be traced are the following: (1) increasing emphasis upon prevention of social ills, with relatively less concern about cure; (2) increasing correlation of social agencies, with the community rather than the individual, as the object of attention; (3) a movement toward more and more governmental support and administration of agencies previously maintained by private philanthropists; (4) the growth of more intelligent standards by which social

workers and their organizations are being put to the test to see precisely what they are doing, to measure their effectiveness, and to evaluate their achievements; (5) the provision of special training for social work so that it may become a profession, resting upon a scientific basis, requiring thorough preparation, offering opportunity for specialization, and substituting dignified professional services for charity; (6) the demonstration by events that the future of social work depends more on general economic and social developments than on the social work of the past.

An effort will be made to relate social work in its development to other aspects of the social process. *We shall start from the present and reach further and further into the past instead of starting at the beginning.* We do not aspire to the exhaustiveness of an all-inclusive narrative. We are simply endeavoring to understand and present so much of the past of social work as may be needed to evaluate its present and to direct its future. If we have included some items of minor significance and omitted others of greater importance, we have erred in judgment. But as to the basis of selection, there should be no doubt.

Throughout the narrative we shall devote more attention to changing attitudes toward the problems of human maladjustment than to the details of social work programs. In so far as we do discuss policies and methods it will be for the purpose of discovering the points of view that lay back of them. The justification of this emphasis lies in the fact that it is in the attitude of the public, the *Zeitgeist*, that we shall find our best clue to the future of social work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE 7

INTRODUCTION 9

PART I

PRESENT TENDENCIES IN SOCIAL WORK

CHAPTER PAGE

I. PROFESSIONALIZING SOCIAL WORK 15

II. CORRELATION OF SOCIAL AGENCIES 31

III. PREVENTIVE AND CONSTRUCTIVE WORK 50

PART II

NINETEENTH CENTURY HUMANITARIANISM

IV. THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION AND SOCIAL WORK 73

V. INDUSTRIAL WELFARE WORK 90

VI. THE CHARITY ORGANIZATION MOVEMENT 103

VII. HOUSING REFORM 119

VIII. THE SETTLEMENT MOVEMENT 130

IX. THE CHILD WELFARE MOVEMENT 145

PART III

THE ENGLISH POOR LAW

X. THE BACKGROUND OF THE ENGLISH POOR LAW 163

XI. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ENGLISH POOR LAW 183

XII. TRANSCENDING THE POOR LAW 200

CHAPTER PAGE

PART IV

THE MEDIEVAL CHURCH AND PHILANTHROPY

XIII. The Religious Merit of Almsgiving 213

XIV. The Development of Ecclesiastical Charities 230

XV. The Medieval Hospital 249

PART V

MUTUAL AID IN MEDIEVAL COMMUNITIES

XVI Manor and Parish 265

XVII. The Medieval Gilds 281

XVIII. The Medieval Towns 292

XIX. Summary and Conclusion 307

Index 323

PART I

PRESENT TENDENCIES IN SOCIAL WORK

CHAPTER I

PROFESSIONALIZING SOCIAL WORK

WHAT is social work? To give a simple definition ought to be easy for one who claims this as his profession. But, as a matter of fact, the field of social service includes so many and so varied activities that the question is very difficult to answer. Caring for needy children in institutions or placing them in foster homes, investigating cases of neglect, abuse or cruelty, supervising delinquents who are placed on probation or parole, untangling family difficulties, providing financial assistance, securing and explaining necessary medical care, finding jobs, inspecting houses and factories, directing leisure time activities, teaching and advising immigrants, promoting public interest in health, thrift and law enforcement—these are a few of the tasks that are performed by people known as social workers.

What puzzles the inquirer most is the fact that even social workers seem to be in confusion as to where their work ends and that of other vocations begins. Sometimes it appears as though every public-spirited citizen would have to be called a social worker. As a matter of fact, some phases of social work are very much like those simple acts of neighborliness whereby people living near together help one another in time of need. Again, it is associated with the giving of casual alms, tossing a coin to the beggar or feeding a tramp at the door. Nearly everyone does these things—whether he should or not—yet without any thought of calling himself a social worker.

Not only has social work been relatively undiffer-

entiated from the things that everybody does; it overlaps the fields of the recognized professions, particularly medicine, law, teaching and the ministry. To be sure, distinctions can be drawn. Thus, while medicine has to do with physical conditions, social work is concerned with relations to other people. As contrasted with law, it stands for the adjustment of attitudes, rather than those formal relationships prescribed in the statute books. It differs from teaching in that the social worker rarely has the opportunity to conduct his "client" through such formal training as the schools provide. It is usually without the theological and metaphysical implications of religious work. Nevertheless, it is a fact that social work overlaps all of these other professions.

Perhaps the nearest we can come to a definition is to say that social work is *the art of adjusting personal relationships,* of helping to overcome the difficulties which may arise, for example, between native and foreign born, between employers and employes, between school and home. These are just the things that each of us tries to do for himself and that we frequently try to do for our friends and neighbors. Most of us have not made a special study of such problems, of their causes or of the scientific basis for their solution. There would be much less confusion if the term social worker were reserved for people who have made such special studies and are trained in scientific methods of dealing with difficult problems of human relationships.

To many people social work is merely another name for charity, that is, any kind of service rendered or goods provided without compensation. If this is correct, then there is justification for the assertion that social work is not a profession, but "an aspect of many professions." Indeed, there has been no little debate as to whether or no

social work should be accorded professional rating. Part of the difficulty has undoubtedly come from the loose use of terms, and it is possible that the issue will be clarified if we agree that certain activities, commonly known as charity, evidently do not constitute the work of a single vocational group; and that many of these activities are not at all professional in character, but are apt to be an incidental part of anyone's life. There are, however, other activities, such, for example, as the services of a probation officer or vocational counsellor, which are specialized and require definite training. It is in this last group, if at all, that a profession of social work is to be found.

Whether or not our first question can be satisfactorily answered, it will be profitable for us to consider another, namely: Is social work passing through a developmental stage very similar to that experienced earlier by the recognized professions, and is it on the way to becoming a profession? The hypothesis which we shall examine is an affirmative answer to this question.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF PROFESSIONAL TRAINING

In order to have a perspective from which to view the process now going on in the field of social work, it will be well for us to review briefly the series of events through which some other professions have attained their present status.

A hundred years ago the teaching of medical students was carried on by physicians who took apprentices. These students went about with the older men, watched them treat their patients and helped to dispense medicines. After a time there began to grow up a number of private medical schools, operated frequently as commercial enterprises, but possessing many advantages over the apprenticeship sys-

tem. They offered fairly definite courses of study, and required more or less laboratory work and observation in clinics before beginning to practise. Later some of the universities established medical schools, and most of the private schools either became affiliated with universities or went out of existence. This meant the more careful organization of curricula and the raising of standards for admission. At the present time the usual preparation of a physician includes a high school education emphasizing the physical sciences, two years of what is usually called pre-medical work in a college or university with a large share of the time spent in laboratories, four years of professional study with further laboratory work and observation in clinics, and finally a year of supervised practise as interne in some hospital.

The developments in engineering, law and the ministry have been similar. Only recently has the apprenticeship system in engineering given way to university professional schools resting on a foundation of general education and specific scientific training. It is still possible to become a lawyer by "reading" in some attorney's office, but the best law schools now require at least three years of college work, emphasizing history, political science and economics, before a student is admitted to the professional courses. Many a man has left the furrow for the ministry with no other preparation than the "call to preach," but today the professional training of a clergyman includes a full college course followed by two or three years in a theological seminary which is frequently one of the graduate departments of a university.

With these developments in mind, let us see what has been happening in the field of social work. For centuries the care of the needy was almost exclusively a function of the church, performed for the most part by persons who

had other duties and who lacked specific training for this work. With the rise of public relief systems charity "got into politics" and was again attended to by people with other duties and lacking in specific training for social work. The nineteenth century movements which we associate with charity organization, social settlements, housing reform and industrial welfare work, were largely pioneering and offered at first little on which professional training could be based.

Happily, however, these agencies did make use of the facilities which were at their disposal and developed an informal sort of apprenticeship. On the whole, it was not wisely planned and succeeded primarily in passing on a few "tricks of the trade." But more recently social agencies have arranged to employ "workers-in-training" who receive their instruction through supervised practise, assigned reading and conferences with superiors. This is probably the apprentice system at its best. The beginners learn a definite technique and are prepared for the tasks of some particular organization or type of work. However, it is safe to say that they do not get a well-rounded view of the field of social work; they do not see it in its relation to the community life as a whole; they are not prepared to apply functional tests to their work and adapt it to new social needs.

The first appearance of something more systematic was the six weeks' course arranged by the New York Charity Organization Society in the summer of 1898. Twenty-seven students were brought together for lectures, visits to institutions and conferences. In 1904 a full year's course was undertaken, being called the New York School of Philanthropy, and operated under the direction of the Committee on Philanthropic Education of the Charity Organization Society. Later a second year was added,

the scope of training was widened and the name was changed to the New York School of Social Work.

In the same year a similar school was established in Boston under the title "School for Social Workers, maintained by Simmons College and Harvard University." Harvard has since withdrawn from participation in its support and the School of Social Work, as it is now called, is operated as a department of Simmons College. Programmes are offered leading to the degree of Bachelor of Science and for college graduates to the degree of Master of Science, and to certificates for persons with irregular education.

In 1903 there was organized the Institute of Social Science, planned as a part of the Extension Division of the University of Chicago. Presently this affiliation was changed for one with the settlement known as Chicago Commons, and later the work was maintained independently as the Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy. In 1920 this institution went out of existence and its activities were taken over again by the University of Chicago to be carried on as a graduate school of social service administration.

There are a number of other schools with similar histories. But a somewhat different development has appeared within certain universities, usually in close relation to their departments of sociology. Until recently this work was largely, if not strictly, academic in character, while that of the so-called "independent" schools was quite the opposite. But during the past few years there have appeared university courses thoroughly "practical" in character and correlated with field work in various social agencies. Among the universities and colleges which have thus provided definite training for social work are: West-

ern Reserve, Minnesota, North Carolina, Ohio State, Toronto, Carnegie Institute, Bryn Mawr and Smith.

During the recent war interest in training for social work was further stimulated by the Red Cross Home Service Institutes. These consisted of short courses, sometimes offered in coöperation with universities, but more often independently, for the purpose of giving such preparation as could be condensed into six or twelve weeks. While these were necessitated by the war emergency, the net result still remains in doubt, for they awarded certificates to a large number of women who imagine themselves to be professional folk, and who have been described, perhaps with unnecessary harshness, as "half-baked social reformers." Similar short courses were arranged by the War Camp Community Service and the National Catholic War Council. The latter has now concentrated upon Clifton, a training school affiliated with the Catholic University of America.

Because of the newness of all this and because of the varied conditions under which training schools have been started, it is but natural that we should find no general agreement as to what should be required for admission and what is the proper content of a professional curriculum. One of the older schools sets forth the following alternative conditions of admission: (1) completion of a college course, (2) graduation from a recognized secondary school, (3) definite social service experience. That these three conditions should be regarded as in any sense equivalents is one reason why the schools of social work are viewed askance by many intelligent people.

There is somewhat more definite understanding as to the courses of study. However, the "independent" schools stress the techniques of particular tasks, while the university schools lay more emphasis upon "theory." In

general, they all include some training in family "case work," neighborhood and community work and social research. Several of the schools have worked out courses in medical-social service, work with delinquents and the care of children. Somewhat newer and less developed is the training of people for service in small towns and rural sections. All the schools set aside a certain portion of the time for supervised field work, but for the most part there is no attempt to distinguish what might be called laboratory work and clinic observation on the one hand from practise on the other. Students are usually plunged immediately into the mazes of diagnosis and treatment, which in the medical schools are withheld until the very end of the training period. All of this presents a striking parallel to the earlier history of professional education in other fields.

FACTORS AFFECTING THE STATUS OF SOCIAL WORK

So far the evidence seems to bear out our hypothesis that social work is not yet a profession, but is in the process of becoming one. The correctness of this judgment may be further determined by the adequacy of the reasons which may be found for the failure of social work to achieve professional standing in the past and for the probability of such achievement in the future.

First, then, what are the factors which have hindered social work hitherto from becoming a profession? We have already noted three: (1) Social work has represented activities not sufficiently differentiated from those of the general public. (2) It overlaps the fields of the recognized professions, notably medicine, law, teaching and the ministry. (3) It includes a wide variety of services, from house-work in an orphanage to administering a federal

bureau, from giving information to travelers to supervising paroled prisoners.

One of the traits that distinguish a profession from other vocations is usually held to be that the former is preëminently an intellectual pursuit with large opportunity for exercising individual initiative. Now these qualities have always been found in some social work, but it is easy to point out many persons calling themselves social workers who are engaged in applying "cut and dried" techniques rather than exercising initiative. The work of many a relief agent, probation officer, institution attendant and employment manager is, after all, pretty much a matter of mechanical routine. This is not because it lacks the possibilities of original work, but rather because of the limited vision and inadequate training of those who do it. This inadequate training is responsible for methods which are the product of a crude trial and error process. Samples of the "rules of thumb" which have stood in the place of scientific methods are the historic "workhouse test," and habitual reliance upon material relief, institutional care, Binet tests, etc.

Perhaps the most important reason why social work has not yet become a profession is the persistence of the apprenticeship system already described. The result is that many social workers are ignorant of the relations between different types of work and still more ignorant of the relation of social work in general to the community life as a whole. The apprenticeship system involves almost automatically the dominance of "rules of thumb" and "tricks of the trade" over scientific principles. It produces social workers whose self-importance ill comports with their narrow vision and limited ability.

But the persistence of the apprenticeship system is in turn due, in part at least, to the late development of social

science. While political science made its appearance long before the nineteenth century, the development of economics is recent, and sociology belongs almost wholly to the last few decades. Even yet social science is in a formative stage. But on the other hand, the social workers have not always been ready to avail themselves of the contributions which the social scientists might have made to their policies and methods.

Finally, among the causes of failure to attain professional standing, we must note the undemocratic character of social work as implied in the word charity. The physician, lawyer, minister and teacher are supported by their clients or by the community as a whole, while the social worker has usually been the emissary of one social class to another. The recognized professional folk deal with problems which may appear in any social or economic group, while the social workers have restricted themselves largely to the so-called "working-classes." The professional folk are engaged in doing things which people need to have done and which in this era of specialization they are not able to do for themselves. There is no assumption of social or economic superiority. There is simply a task to be performed which requires a special kind of ability and training. The social worker, on the other hand, has not yet escaped the stigma of doing things that "normal" people ought to do for themselves. He is looked upon as handing down to the inferior classes some of the surplus of the superior.

Now it is a revulsion against just this sort of thing that is providing one of the most powerful impulses for the professionalizing of social work. Charity has sometimes been presented as a device for quieting unrest and avoiding important social or economic readjustments. But the scorn of the socialist, the trade-unionist and often

the moderate liberal for charity is being felt. The most obvious response is the changing of names. Charity organization societies are becoming family welfare associations; boards of charity are becoming boards of public welfare; conferences of charities are becoming conferences of social agencies; schools of philanthropy are becoming schools of social work. There is a marked effort to shake off the past and make a new start, not only in name, but in character and scope of work as well. Additional impetus is given to this transition by the gradually increasing use of social agencies by the well-to-do, sometimes with the payment of a fee for the service, and by the extension of governmental participation in social work. Just as there need be no humiliation in consultation with a physician, attorney, architect or engineer, so it may be that the social worker will presently be looked to by all of us for the rendering of certain specialized services.

The demand for the professionalizing of social work is bound up with the democratic movement. But it is the rise of social science that is making possible the equipment of workers able to render the technical services required. Already social science, particularly sociology, has established the fact of the relativity of moral codes and the general manner in which social institutions grow and decay. It has demonstrated the intimate relations of government, industry, religion, family—in other words, the unity of the social process. It has shown the importance and some methods of applying functional tests to social agencies. It has made clear the possibility of controlling many of the conditions of our common life. True, much that passes as social science is unscientific both in spirit and method, but in spite of this there are growing up techniques, funds of information and gen-

eral principles quite as worthy of confidence as many of those of physical science.

With the development of social science, it is becoming more and more possible to build up schools for the training of social workers on a basis that may properly be called professional. The "institutes", the "independent" schools and the university departments all are making increasing use of the results of scientific research in the realm of social problems. More and more a knowledge of these results and a specialized training based on them are being demanded of candidates for positions in social work.

Further evidences of the evolution of a profession are to be seen in the *esprit de corps* cultivated by conferences, federations and publications. They appear in the efforts to establish common standards and to outline "professional ethics". Finally, we are defining more clearly the tasks which we expect social workers to perform. In general, these tasks involve the adjustment of personal relations. Specifically, they include the securing of information which makes possible programs for the meeting of emergencies, the correction of dangerous habits and protection of incompetents. Very often they consist in making plans and giving advice concerning family relations, education, employment and community organization. They usually involve the clearing up of misunderstandings, the relieving of worries and removing the sources of personal friction.

But what of the rapid "socialization" of the other professions? The question has been asked, if the community is served to the utmost by the teachers, doctors, lawyers, ministers, etc., what will remain for the social workers? It is probably true that many of the services now performed by social workers will be gradually turned

over to members of other professions, and that others will be eliminated as unnecessary. But it seems quite certain that there will be a residium centering about the service to persons seriously out of adjustment with their surroundings and to groups badly disorganized. Whether the term social work be attached to the civic responsibilities of everyone or to the specialized services just indicated matters little. The probabilities are that the latter will become the function of a definite professional group; while the former, under a different name, or perhaps bearing no specific label, will be frankly unprofessional. The signs point to a minimizing in the twentieth century of charity, philanthropy, uplift, etc., with the development on the one hand of professional service, and on the other the expansion of civic responsibilities of the common man.

SUGGESTED READINGS

Is Social Work a Profession?

The Profession of Social Work. Published by the National Social Workers' Exchange. New York, 1921.

Nat. Conf. Social Work, 1917, 112–115, 370–371; 1915, 575–606.

Survey, 35, 386-389, 408-410; 40, 125-126.

Science and Social Work

Todd, Arthur J.: *The Scientific Spirit and Social Work.* New York: Macmillan, 1919.

Queen, Stuart A.: *Social Science in the Colleges.* Baltimore: *Goucher College Bulletin*, 1920.

Nat. Conf. Social Work, 1919, 358–365 (sociology); 1918, 329–340 (psychology), 683–693 (sociology); 1917, 101–112 (medicine and psychology); 1916, 495–501 (medicine); 1915, 307–339 (abnormal psychology and psychiatry).

Amer. Jour. Soc., 18, 215–221 (social technology); 21, 721–864 (sociology).

Training for Social Work

Steiner, Jesse F.: *Training for Social Work.* Chicago: *University of Chicago Press,* 1921. Also *Amer. Jour. Soc.,* Jan., Mar. and May, 1921.

Brackett, Jeffrey R.: *Supervision and Education in Charity.* New York: Macmillan, 1903, Chap. 7 and 8.

U. S. Bur. Educ., 1915, 345–359.

Nat. Conf. Social Work, 1919, 593–611; 1915, 606–626.

Nat. Conf. Char. and Char., 1913, 376–379; 1911, 365–400.

School and Society, 7, 271-277.

London Char. Org. Soc. Occasional Papers, 1900, No. 11, pp. 129–138; 1905, No. 3, pp. 39–45.

See bulletins and catalogs of various schools of social work, *e.g.,* New York School of Social Work, Simmons College School of Social Work, University of Chicago School of Social Service Administration, Missouri School of Social Economy, Smith College Training School for Social Work.

CHAPTER II

CORRELATION OF SOCIAL AGENCIES

Of tremendous significance for its future are the various movements which aim at bringing together the host of individuals and organizations engaged in social work. Much is being said and done today concerning federation, unification, standardization and other phases of correlation. As other aspects of this same tendency we may regard governmental participation and supervision and a challenging of social work by the public in general. In it all, there is a diminution of the prominence frequently given to particular organizations and individual workers, with an increasing emphasis upon the community as a whole and its needs.

The correlation of social agencies is by no means a new thing. Indeed, the philanthropies of the middle ages were correlated to a certain extent, because practically all of them were administered by the great ecclesiastical system which had its center at Rome. Nevertheless, in its practical working out, the relief work of each monastery, hospital and parish was relatively independent. When we come down to the modern period, we find the English system of poor relief organized on a local basis and the American scheme of public charities followed closely the English plan. When we get into the nineteenth century, the number of private organizations without official relations to one another becomes enormous. Even at the present day many serious workers are disturbed at the multitude of agencies operating along similar lines.

As evidence of the need for correlation, two or three

instances may be cited. When Dr. Richard A. Bolt became National Director of the American Child Hygiene Association, he sent out letters to all national organizations which he had reason to believe were working in the field of child hygiene. The replies to his inquiries revealed the fact that there are today some eighty different national societies at work in this field. Another instance appears in the public school system of the state of Virginia. Here there are at least seven separate groups undertaking to organize the school children for various civic purposes. First, there is the Coöperative Educational Association, organizing its Junior Community Leagues. Then comes the National Tuberculosis Association, with its Modern Health Crusaders. The American Red Cross appears with a program no less ambitious for its Junior membership. The Extension Department of Virginia Polytechnic Institute is organizing boys' and girls' clubs, especially in the rural districts. The Federation of Women's Clubs is promoting a thrift campaign. And finally, the Young Men's Christian Association and the Young Women's Christian Association are planning to extend the work of their boys' and girls' departments.

There are many different types of correlation and integration of social agencies, to five outstanding forms of which we shall give our attention. They are, respectively, correlation through state and national societies, through supervision, councils of social agencies, financial federations and actual amalgamation.

NATIONAL AND STATE ORGANIZATIONS

The national and state societies are of three general types—those whose chief function is the holding of an annual conference, those that are actually carrying on

a definite program of social work, and those that are primarily religious.

Of the national conferences, the best known is the National Conference of Social work, which was organized in the early seventies as the National Conference of Charities and Correction. The purpose of this society was to bring together those engaged in the administration of various philanthropic and correctional agencies, and other public-spirited citizens interested in improved facilities for the care of dependents, defectives and delinquents. For a long time, the attention of the Conference centered largely upon problems of providing for the "disadvantaged classes". But even at the beginning, there were some who saw the inadequacy of mere palliative measures, and as the years went by there was more and more emphasis upon preventive and constructive work. This broadening interest finally received recognition in the change of name in 1916. The present scope of the Conference may be suggested by enumerating the committees which prepared the program of the 1920 meeting. There were committees on children, delinquents and correction, health, public agencies and institutions, the family, industrial and economic problems, the local community, mental hygiene, organization of social forces and the uniting of native and foreign-born in America.

Another national organization of historical interest, which also dates from the seventies, is the American Prison Association. This is, as its name signifies, much more specialized than the National Conference of Social work, but it too has gone through a transition from attention primarily to details of administration and treatment to a consideration of means of preventing delinquency.

Time and space forbid that we do more than enumerate a few of the many other national organizations which

hold annual conferences and which bring together social workers for a better understanding and closer coördination of effort. Just as samples, we mention the American Association for Organizing Family Social Work, the National Federation of Settlements, the National Children's Home Society, National Conference on the Education of Backward, Truant and Delinquent Children, National Probation Association, National Organization for Public Health Nursing, American Association of Hospital Social Workers, Playground and Recreation Association of America, Association of Training Schools for Professional Social Work.

Many of these national organizations are also organized on a state-wide basis, the state societies frequently being branches of the national associations. Among the earliest of these state organizations to develop were the State Conferences of Charities and Corrections, now for the most part known by names similar to the new title of the National Conference. These State Conferences were stimulated by the national organization, but until recently have had no official relation to it, and even now, the majority of them are quite independent.

So far, we have discussed organizations whose principal function, or at least, whose original purpose was the holding of an annual meeting. Many of them, of course, carry on publicity or research work throughout the year. However, they differ fundamentally from another group of nation- and state-wide agencies, which are administering more or less definite programs. Among these are the American Red Cross, Community Service, Inc., the National Desertion Bureau, American Association for Labor Legislation and some of the public health agencies discussed in another chapter.

The Red Cross was started originally for purely

military relief, and the supplementing of medical service in the army. Later, it added as a peace time activity the administration of relief in times of disaster, such as fire, flood and earth-quake. During the great War, it assumed responsibilty for looking after the families of men who entered upon military or naval service. In addition, it undertook to adjust many matters for the enlisted men themselves.

Chapters of the Red Cross were organized in every city and in almost every county of the United States. Each chapter had committees to handle various aspects of its work. Some of these have completed their task, but in many communities Home Service is being continued, not merely to adjust various matters for disabled and discharged soldiers but also to carry on peace time activities. Especially in the South and West, where there are few organized social agencies, does it seem likely that Home Service will continue and expand its activities. Another phase of Red Cross work that is spreading is its health service. Many chapters are employing public health nurses and some are organizing health centers.

Being organized on a nation-wide scale, it has been necessary for the Red Cross to develop and maintain a somewhat elaborate administrative machine. At the top is National Headquarters which maps out general policies and helps the divisions to put them into effect. These divisions comprise groups of contiguous states. There were until recently fourteen divisions with field staffs which visit the local chapters to assist and stimulate them in a variety of ways. Each chapter usually covers a county or city and is further subdivided into branches and auxiliaries.

We shall not take the time to describe others of the national organizations, but instead will outline the work-

ing agreement entered into by the American Red Cross, the National Tuberculosis Association, and the National Organization for Public Health Nursing early in 1920. The coöperative plan covers education, recruiting and employment of public health nurses, assigning to each organization certain specific functions, and providing definite machinery for coördination. This last consists of a joint consultation committee made up of the Secretary of the National Organization for Public Health Nursing, the Director of the Bureau of Public Health Nursing of the Red Cross, and Secretary for Nursing of the National Tuberculosis Association. This committee meets frequently for conferences relative to problems and projects confronting or contemplated by any one of the three. In addition, there are state committees on Public Health Nursing, which usually represent these three organizations and the State Departments of Health. These committees, without assuming administrative responsibility, devote themselves to the advancement of public health nursing through the stimulation of public opinion, through interpretation and advice, and through the promotion of coördination. Finally, there are exchanges of memoranda regarding new programs or changes in policies before these are put into operation.

CORRELATION THROUGH SUPERVISION

A very different sort of correlation has come about through the supervision of social agencies by various public and private bodies. Largely under the influence of the National and State Conferences of Charities and Correction, many states have established departments bearing such names as Board of Charities and Correction, Board of Control, Commissioners of Public Welfare or Board of Administration. In the main, their duties are super-

visory and their powers are limited to inspection and recommendation. Some of them, however, have been given very large administrative powers, especially over state institutions for the insane, feeble-minded, epileptic and delinquent. A very few have limited administrative authority over county jails, alms-houses and hospitals, and over municipal institutions of a similar nature.

More recently, the State Boards have been given responsibility for the care of dependent children. Frequently, they are authorized to license and regulate orphanages and other children's homes, child-placing societies and maternity hospitals. Usually the State Board has a certain amount of police power to enforce its requirements. But ordinarily, great caution has been exercised to avoid setting arbitrary standards which were not understood nor desired, at least by the better private agencies. In some states, the Boards have called together representatives of the various organizations affected to talk over with them just what should be required in order that their work might justify itself before the public. By this coöperative plan of arriving at standards, the Boards have been much more successful in improving the character of institutions and societies than they could possibly have been had their methods been more autocratic. Because the staff of the average State Board is utterly inadequate to perform the task assigned, it has sometimes been the practice to delegate part of the work to local authorities and sometimes to private agencies. Thus the California State Board of Charities and Corrections has endeavored to bring private boarding homes for children under the supervison of the licensed child-placing societies. In cities in which the local Health Departments or Charities Commissions are regarded as having satisfactory standards and the means for enforcing

them, licenses are issued by the State Board upon recommendation of the local authority.

Another phase of the correlation developed by the State Departments has been the holding of frequent conferences of people engaged or interested in the care of needy children. Usually these meetings are held at some institution, or the office of some other agency, in order that the discussions may be supplemented by personal inspection of equipment and observation of methods.

In the West and South, a number of cities have undertaken to adapt the State Board of Charities plan to the municipality. In 1913, the Los Angeles City Council passed an ordinance creating a Municipal Charities Commission, empowering it to:

(1) Investigate all charities dependent upon public appeal, or general solicitation of funds, for their support, and to endorse such of them as meet the actual needs of the community, and attain a reasonable standard of efficiency, and are so conducted as to insure the public of a wise use of funds;

(2) To encourage the formation of new private charities to meet the needs not already provided for;

(3) To collect and preserve statistics relating to charities, conditions of life, unemployment and delinquency; and maintain a constant survey of the field of charity;

(4) To disburse all funds apportioned by the city for charitable purposes;

(5) To receive donations, gifts, or bequests, to be used for charitable purposes, and administer the same;

(6) To establish and maintain free employment bureaus, et cetera.

At the same time, the City Council passed a Penal Ordinance which provided for the regulation of the soliciting of alms and contributions for charitable purposes,

and prohibited begging. In carrying out the provisions of these acts, the Commisson incurred the bitter enmity of the Salvation Army, which carried its case finally to the Supreme Court of California. The decision handed down was to the effect that certain parts of the ordinance were unconstitutional, because in them the City Council had undertaken to delegate to the Commission powers which the city itself did not possess.

Because of personal jealousy and animosity rather than because of this decision, both of the ordinances were repealed and new ones put in their place, establishing a Social Service Commission with decidedly limited power. The spirit of the new ordinances is indicated by certain phrases which appear in them. Thus the Commission is authorized to investigate charitable or philanthropic organizations when requested or permitted by the officers thereof. The Commission now endorses instead of licensing such organizations, and is thus practically on a par with the Charities Endorsement Committees of various Chambers of Commerce.

In a number of cities such as Cleveland, Chicago, St. Louis and San Francisco, the Chambers of Commerce, Merchants Associations, or similar bodies have appointed Charities Endorsement Committees. Their purpose has been primarily to protect their members from the appeals of fraudulent solicitors, but they have frequently gone beyond this merely negative and prohibitive program. Following the lead of the State Boards, they have sometimes undertaken to bring together the officers of various agencies in order that there might be a better mutual understanding and a closer coördination of effort. Probably their chief value has been the collection of more or less comprehensive information about the social agencies of the city.

In St. Louis, the Chamber of Commerce Endorsement Committee now requires membership in the Council of Social Agencies before placing its stamp of approval upon any organization. Any group of people desiring to secure general support for a new social activity, or the extension of an old one, will almost certainly come to the Chamber of Commerce. In each case, the Chamber asks for a report from the central council. A special committee of the council is then appointed, and its reports are presented first to the council and then to the Charities Endorsement Committee.

Similar to this sort of supervision is the work of the National Investigation Bureau. This grew out of the many inquiries brought to the Bureau of Advice and Information of the Charity Organization Society of New York, concerning various war charities. The committee requested the Council of National Defense to assume the responsibility for endorsing war charities, but nothing was done by the council, and the Charity Organization Society itself began to issue bulletins of approved war activities. These were continued until October, 1918, when eight of the leading "war chests" joined in organizing the National Investigation Bureau. The movement spread rapidly, and as a result many ill-considered efforts were eliminated, or kept from coming into existence.

COUNCILS OF SOCIAL AGENCIES

We turn now to what are called Councils of Social Agencies. The general idea of the central council seems to have grown out of the field work inaugurated by the Charity Organization Department of the Russell Sage Foundation, and later transferred to the American Association for Organizing Family Social Work. As distinguished from a City Conference on Social Work, or a

Social Workers' Club, a Central Council is essentially a body composed of official delegates from various agencies. Some of the councils have started somewhat after the fashion of an exclusive club, admitting only recognized and approved organizations, while others undertook to bring in as many as possible at the very start. In general, however, opportunist policies have been followed, and a variety of local and temporary circumstances have determined what groups should be included. Such central councils have been established in a number of the larger cities and are now being introduced into smaller communities Among the better known Councils are those of St. Louis, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, Chicago, and Cincinnati.

The methods by which a Central Council may make contributions to the social life of a community are thus described by Francis H. McLean.

(1) By bringing about the improvement of methods, policies and ideals in the work of individual social agencies.

(2) By developing a better inter-play between the work of different agencies, resulting in greater economy and efficiency of effort on the part of all of them.

(3) By demonstrating to their respective communities the need for the establishment of new social agencies, either public or private, or the extension of the work of old ones.

(5) By developing joint action for the advancement of reforms in public administrative departments or for the passage of new social legislation.

(6) By developing a program of social development which may look many years into the future, but which will make clear just what new activities in the social field should next be undertaken by the community. That

is, councils should always have formulated plans for progressive and logical development in the social field.

(7) By holding conferences and printing material on subjects of general interest to the social agencies; as, for instance, on right methods of publicity for different kinds of agency. This may include joint schemes for educating the community as to the methods and ends of social work.

(8) By inaugurating and carrying on joint activities for the benefit of all the agencies. Thus the central councils have in a number of places become responsible for the social service exchange. In Chicago, Milwaukee and Minneapolis they have established bureaus for the enrollment and assignment of volunteer service. In Chicago and Milwaukee the council is considering the question of joint purchase of supplies.

There are other sorts of community councils which include agencies not ordinarily regarded as belonging in the field of social work. Their activities, however, are frequently so similar in character that it is worth while to call attention to their existence. Such organizations are the County Councils, promoted by the State Colleges of Agriculture and the Inter-Church World Movement. In this same category might be listed the Community Leagues organized by the Coöperative Education Association of Virginia.

FINANCIAL FEDERATIONS

Similar in many respects to the Councils of Social Agencies are the so-called Financial Federations. As a matter of fact, some of the federations have exactly the same functions as the central councils, with the added work of coöperative budget making and money raising. In exactly the same manner as the central councils, the

federations undertake to standardize salaries and methods of work, conduct surveys and continuous research, carry on educational and publicity work, and bring together members of constituent agencies for frequent conference.

The need for financial federation was most urgently felt by those who saw trained social workers compelled to devote an exorbitant part of their time to money raising. They saw also the waste and friction involved in repeated appeals, frequently to precisely the same people. Some of the promoters of these federations, indeed, were among the generous givers to whom a multitude of agencies sent a continual stream of requests for money.

The federation idea seems to have started in Denver, back in the eighties. For a time no other city followed this lead. About a decade later, it was taken up by the Jews with the result that there is now in almost every city of importance a Federation of Jewish Charities. Finally, the idea reappeared in Cleveland in 1913 on a community basis.

In that year, the Federation for Charity and Philanthropy was started with a Board of thirty prominent citizens representing donors, institutions and general public. The following year, the Cleveland Welfare Council was started, to act as an advisory body to the new City Department of Public Welfare, and to provide a city-wide clearing house for surveys and other welfare activities and plans. In 1917, the Welfare Council and the Federation for Charity and Philanthropy were merged under the new name of the Welfare Federation of Cleveland. In this organization over sixty agencies are allied in money-raising activities, and some twenty others are coöperating members.

The result of this movement in Cleveland has been a tremendous increase in the number of persons giving to

social work, and in the amount of money raised. It has brought about much closer coöperation among the various agencies of the city, and a larger appreciation of the needs of the community as a whole.

As a matter of fact, it is a bit misleading to describe these organizations as financial federations, but the financial aspect of their work is the key to many of their other activities. Roscoe C. Edlund has pointed out clearly the way in which coöperative budget making and money raising contributes toward the development of community planning.

"If the representatives of all agencies that are members of a community-wide federation come together to put on the table before them the plans which are to cost money, and if these representatives go into the details as to what each expenditure means, they are by that very act beginning to understand their united program for the community as they never understood it before. In the doing of it, they are bound to weigh one need against another; they are bound to see where are the gaps; and they are bound to see where there is overlapping. Coöperative budget making, then, is the beginning of coöperative social service planning of a different sort from that where each agency simply asks the community for the amount of funds which in its own judgment is necessary for its work, that judgment not being checked up by comparison with the plans of other social agencies in the same city."

At least passing mention should be made of the "war chests" of 1917–18, and the great Seven-fold Drive of 1918. The principles underlying both of these movements were identical with those which lie back of the more permanent federations. They took their cue from the centralization of the business world and large scale production

in industry. In spite of their many faults, they unquestionably resulted in tremendous saving of energy and time, and greatly increased the money which was raised.

AMALGAMATION

Finally, we may observe some cases of complete amalgamation of previously independent social agencies. Sometimes this fusion comes about under private auspices, as in the case of the older charity organization societies, and sometimes under government auspices.

An example of the first type of amalgamation is the Social Service Bureau of Houston, Texas. The Social Service Bureau took over the activities previously carried on by the Houston Settlement Association, the Anti-Tuberculosis League, the Harris County Humane Society, the Houston Kindergarten Association, and the Playground Association. This consolidation was brought about under more or less external pressure. A considerable sum of money in the form of a municipal subsidy was also held out as an inducement for coming together. But the Social Service Bureau is still a private agency, and in no sense a part of the city government.

Fresno County, California, is a good example of amalgamation under public auspices. There was created in 1916 a County Relief and Employment Commission, appointed by the Board of Supervisors, to take over the work of the county outdoor relief department, the municipal employment bureau and a citizens' relief committee. The commission itself consisted of seven unpaid members who were authorized by ordinance to employ certain paid workers. After a year's trial it was decided to carry the plan of consolidation still farther. Under the head of a new Commission of Public Welfare there were brought together the work of the Relief and Employment

Commission, the administration of the county hospital, almshouse, orphanage and dispensary and a private organization known as the Fresno County Humane Society.

After watching the growth of the Fresno County plan, the California State Board of Charities and Corrections undertook to organize similar commissions in other counties. In each instance the local situation was carefully studied and a special ordinance was drafted. Something like ten other counties have since adopted such plans for correlation of their social agencies.

Similar schemes are being worked out in Iowa and North Carolina. The so-called Iowa plan, briefly, involves the creation of a central organization variously known as social welfare bureau, social welfare league, or social service league. This board is composed of representative men and women who serve without pay; the members of the county board of supervisors are included as members *ex-officio.* Under the control of this board is centered all of the private charity of the community and the handling of the county poor fund. The latter is secured by utilizing the same worker for the two offices of secretary of the central bureau and of that of overseer of the poor. Private and county funds are kept distinct. Salaries of the trained workers and other administrative expenses are divided by mutual agreement between the central board and the county board. The plan is a purely voluntary one and has been adopted following local agitation, and in several instances was preceded by a brief survey of the field.

The North Carolina scheme differs from those of Iowa and California in that the state law now compels every county to have a Superintendent of Public Welfare, responsible directly to a County Board of Public Welfare and indirectly to the corresponding state department. The

plan is somewhat less flexible than the others, but the chief difficulty has been that of finding persons qualified to assume the duties of Superintendent of Public Welfare.

Just where the Board of Public Welfare idea originated is hard to say, but one of the first departments of this sort was organized in Kansas City in 1910. The Kansas City Board brought together under a single superintendent the following varied but related departments. It has first of all a research department which has made studies of employment, housing conditions, industrial accidents, child labor and other social problems. The Board also carries on the work of charities' endorsement. It has a Social Service Department correlated with the Kansas City Provident Association to carry on relief work. It maintains a Charities' Registration Bureau, a Free Legal Aid Bureau, Welfare Loan Agency, and Free Employment Bureau for men and women who are temporarily stranded or unable to work. It provides meals and lodging at the Helping Hand Institute. It maintains departments of factory and housing inspection. It administers a municipal farm for male misdemeanants, women's reformatory and parole department, and provides relief to prisoners' families while the men are in prison. It supervises the commercial recreation of the city, dance halls, skating rinks and moving pictures. Since the organization of the Kansas City Board of Public Welfare in 1910, similar departments have been established in Cleveland, Dayton, Chicago, St. Joseph, St. Louis, Denver, Duluth, Omaha, and various other places.

We have seen how the multiplication of social agencies, particularly during the nineteenth century, gave rise to an enormous amount of overlapping, neglect, friction, misunderstanding and general waste of effort. We have seen that there is still very great need for further coör-

dination of our many organizations. We are led to suspect that not a few could well be dispensed with. But at the same time, we have noted the growing tendency to bring independent organizations together, and to coördinate their activities.

This movement toward correlation has aroused no little hostility among some of the older social agencies. They fear that there is danger that their own work may be swallowed up in a great impersonal federation which will force all of its constituent members into a "drab unindividualized uniformity." No doubt, there is in some cases the risk that the central council or the federation may become autocratic and result in more harm than good. No doubt, for some people, interest in amalgamation and consolidation has become a sort of fad or craze. But for all that, no one can deny the very great need for correlation, and no careful observer would be likely to deny that it is actually coming to pass, whether he desires it or not.

SUGGESTED READINGS

National and State Organizations

See the "Survey" for directories of social agencies and announcements of meetings.

See Bulletins of the National Conference of Social Work for information about state conferences.

Hendricks, Genevieve P.: *Handbook of Social Resources of the United States.* Washington: Amer. Red Cross, 1921.

Supervision

Warner, A. G.: *American Charities.* Third Ed., Chap. 21.

Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work (formerly National Conference of Charities and Correction), especially 1893, 33–51; 1909, 397–413, 526.

See reports of various State Boards of Charities, *e.g.*, Indiana Board of State Charities, California State Board of Charities and Corrections, Georgia State Board of Public Welfare, New York State Board of Charities.

See reports of various Municipal Charities Commissions, *e.g.*, Los Angeles Social Service Commission, Houston Foundation.
See reports of various Charities Endorsement Committee, *e.g.*, Chicago Association of Commerce, Columbus Chamber of Commerce, Minneapolis Civic and Commerce Association, St. Louis Business Men's League.
Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work, especially 1913, 84–92, 100–111; 1916, 329–336; 1919, 703–709.

Councils of Social Agencies

McLean, Francis H.: *The Central Council of Social Agencies.* New York, Amer. Ass'n. for Org. Fam. Soc. Work, 1919.
See reports of various councils, *e. g.*, Chicago, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, St. Louis.

Financial Federations

Financial Federations. Report of Special Committee of Amer. Assn. for Org. Charity. New York, 1917.
Proceedings Nat. Conf. Soc. Work, especially 1913, 111–115; 1917, 503–521; 1918, 589–595, 605–614; 1919, 670–679, 697–703, 710–724.
Jacobs, Joseph: *The Federation Movement in American Jewish Philanthropy. Amer. Jewish Year-Book,* 1915–16, 159–198.
See reports of various financial federations, *e.g.*, Baltimore Alliance of Charitable and Social Agencies, Cleveland Welfare Federation, Milwaukee Centralized Budget of Philanthropies.

Amalgamation

See reports of State Boards of Administration or Control, *e.g.*, Illinois Department of Public Welfare, Iowa State Board of Control, Ohio State Board of Administration, Rhode Island Board of State Charities and Corrections.
McClenahan, Bessie A.: *Iowa Plan for the Combination of Public and Private Relief, University of Iowa Studies in Social Science.* Vol. 5, No. 3, 1918.
County Outdoor Relief in California. Bulletin of the State Board of Charities and Corrections, 1918.
Proceedings, Nat. Conf. Soc. Work, 1918, 595–604; 1919, 546–549.
Survey, 41, 872; 43, 140–143.
See reports of various municipal Boards of Public Welfare, *e.g.*, Chicago, Dayton, Kansas City, Omaha.
Proceedings, Nat. Conf. Soc. Work, 1916, 306–316, 387–418.
See reports of Houston, Texas, Social Service Bureau.

CHAPTER III

PREVENTIVE AND CONSTRUCTIVE WORK

As we look over the field of social work, we find three fairly distinct, though not incompatible purposes manifested. The first is naturally the curative, the effort to care for those who are now sick, hungry, or otherwise in need. The second is the preventive. Its program is that of guarding against the recurrence of sickness, unemployment, delinquency, etc. This is a newer idea, but it seems to be the dominant *motif* in social work today. The third purpose is the constructive, not merely seeking to ward off evils that beset us, but looking forward to the positive achievement of health and happiness. So far as social work is concerned, this idea is the newest of all and may belong to the future rather than to the past. Of course, none of these purposes has ever been wholly absent, and any given program of work may embody all three. But there is this difference of emphasis which it seems important to examine rather carefully.

THE PUBLIC HEALTH MOVEMENT

The organized avoidance of human ills seems to have made its first appearance in the field of preventive medicine and public health. We will note later the way in which modern science has made possible the control of certain communicable diseases. But first we will consider some of those agences which have utilized this growing scientific knowledge and made it contribute directly to the public health movement.

One of the most notable organizations is the National

Association for the Study and Prevention of Tuberculosis, now known as the National Tuberculosis Association, which was founded in 1905. The motive of this society is not that of providing care for the indigent sick, but a direct endeavor to combat disease and promote public health. The clinics which have been started and supported by the Association are regarded as partly educational and partly for the purpose of diagnosing and treating cases of tuberculosis. A large part of the work has been the spreading of educational propaganda, from lectures and moving picture shows, to advertising leaflets and Red Cross seals. The visiting nurse, also, has had an important part in the educational work of this organization. But perhaps the most significant feature of its activities has been the stimulation of interest in health matters among school children, through the organization of the Modern Health Crusaders.

Another phase of the public health movement has been the campaign to "Save the Babies". Starting with some local efforts, this developed, in 1909, into the National Association for the Study and Prevention of Infant Mortality, now known as the American Child Hygiene Association. The work of this Society, like that of the one just named, is largely educational, through the holding of conferences, distribution of literature, lectures and the publication of a magazine. The purpose is to acquaint the general public with means of preventing infant mortality and sickness. At the same time, a marked influence is being exercised upon the medical profession.

A large part in this movement has also been taken by the Federal Children's Bureau, which has conducted numerous investigations into the causes and means of preventing infant mortality. The Children's Bureau has also utilized lectures, conferences, exhibits, leaflets and other forms of publicity.

Under the stimulus of these and other agencies, dispensaries and out-patient departments for the treatment of crippled children and sick babies have been established in large numbers. But most significant of all, a great many new clinics, or rather advisory conferences, have been founded for "well babies."

A third phase of the public health movement is frequently referred to as school hygiene. By this is meant medical inspection of school children, school clinics, school nurses and special instruction in personal hygiene. Medical inspection of schools at first was practically restricted to the detection of contagious diseases, but from this its scope has been extended in many communities to the discovery of diseases of every description, and of various physical and mental defects. In spite of oppositon on the ground that this was interfering with personal liberty, the practice has spread to almost every city in America and to a great many rural communities. Of course the mere detection of defects is of little consequence unless something is done for their removal. So in addition to advising school children and their parents about their eyes, teeth, throats, etc., many school departments have established clinics, and have added visiting nurses to their staff.

A fourth phase of the public health movement is illustrated by the National Committee for Mental Hygiene. This organization came into existence in 1909 in response to a wide-spread belief that some national agency should be created to help protect the mental health of the public, to work for the prevention of nervous and mental disorders, and to help to raise the standards of care and treatment of the insane throughout the United States. This agency, like the others we have noted, devotes itself largely to investigation and educational propaganda. It has stimulated the establishment of psychopathic clinics and hospitals such as

the Phipps Clinic in Baltimore, and the Boston Psychopathic Hospital. In Massachusetts, a chain of such clinics has been established all over the state for the purpose of doing preventive and follow-up work.

A similar activity is that of the American Social Hygiene Association, which announces that it stands for the conservation of the family, the repression of prostitution, the reduction of venereal diseases, and the promotion of sound sex education. In numerous cities, clinics have been established for the treatment and control of venereal disease; and during the recent war, the United States Public Health Service and the War Department established a large number of such clinics especially for the protection of the soldiers.

Finally, we may note the health center which is being promoted especially by the American Red Cross. A health center is described as the physical headquarters of the public health work of the community. It constitutes a business-like way of putting health activities both public and private under one roof in daily touch and in complete mutual understanding. The health center thus represents one of the latest steps in the evolution of public health work and serves to bring together important but usually independent health campaigns, such as those mentioned above.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Another phase of the preventive movement is to be seen in the field of labor legislation. This may be considered as having been begun with the English law of 1802, which had as its principal object the protection of health and morals of pauper children employed in cotton factories. From this legislation has gone on to include

other groups of working people, and many aspects of their working conditions.

The hours of labor were first restricted for children, and later limitations were placed upon the hours that women might spend in factories. Most of the American states now place maximum limits of varying amounts for both of these groups, but there has been relatively little legislation to regulate the hours that men may work. Limits have been placed upon the working day for federal and many state employes. Also the time that railway workers may spend on duty is an object of regulation in numerous states. But practically the only group of grown men affected by such laws is that engaged in underground mining.

In addition to undertaking the control of hours of labor, most modern states also regulate the manner of paying wages. Frequently they require that payments must be made weekly or bi-weekly. Often they forbid payment in the form of script or store orders, and undertake to prevent compulsory dealing at company stores. But more important than these have been the minimum wage laws, the first of which was passed by the Parliament of Victoria, Australia, in 1896. Since that time, numerous American states have passed similar laws, and their constitutionality has been upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States in the famous Oregon case. The usual plan has been not to fix a minimum wage directly by law, but to create boards or commissions with the authority to hold hearings, conduct investigations, and make orders for specified industries and covering specified periods of time.

Another group of labor laws has had to do with health and safety of the working people. They cover such matters as light, air, seats, lavatories, rest rooms, first aid

equipment, enclosure of dangerous machinery, warning signs, etc.

Still another group of laws has modified the Common Law affecting responsibility for accidents. Under the Common Law, the employer is obliged to provide his workmen with a reasonably safe place in which to work, and is liable for any accident resulting from failure to display this ordinary prudence and care. These precautions having been taken, the employe assumes all the risks and hazards incident to the employment, or arising out of negligence and carelessness of fellow servants.

In what are known as Employers' Liability Acts, the duties of employers have been more definitely described; the fellow servant and contributory negligence doctrines have been modified or set aside, and employers have been made liable for injuries occurring under specified circumstances. The Employers' Liability Acts have rested on the assumption that it is possible to fix responsibility for accidents definitely upon individuals and that the best way to prevent accidents is to make the blameworthy parties bear the consequences of their negligence. But because accidents arise largely from the necessities of modern industry rather than from individual fault, it has come to be felt quite generally that the cost of protection should be a charge upon the industry.

This opinion has been fully accepted in most countries of the civilized world, and the law of Employers' Liability has usually been superseded by Workmen's Compensation Acts, which compel the employer to indemnify his workman for every injury not caused by the misconduct of the victim himself. The compensation is usually fixed and definite, though ordinarily adjusted to the seriousness of the accident, the period of incapacity, and the number of persons dependent upon the victim. In order to insure the

payment of the compensation, employers in many states are compelled to take out accident insurance for their workmen, either with private companies or with the state itself. Thus protection against industrial accidents has progressed from the old common law basis of assumption of risk, contributory negligence, and the fellow servant doctrine, through Employers' Liability and Workmen's Compensation to Compulsory Accident Insurance.

SOCIAL INSURANCE

Accidents, however, represent only one group of the incidents of life against which provision may be made by insurance. Some of the others are sickness, old age, invalidity, unemployment, maternity and death. In a number of countries, such insurance has been made compulsory for all people with incomes under a certain amount. Among these countries are Germany, Austria, Hungary, Great Britain, Russia, Norway and The Netherlands. Some other countries such as Denmark, Switzerland and France have established voluntary, subsidized systems.

In about fifteen states, commissions have been appointed to investigate one or more phases of social insurance and report to the Governor and Legislature. Of these, the California, New York and Ohio commissions rendered favorable reports; while those of Illinois, Connecticut and Wisconsin brought in adverse reports. So far, no American state seems to have got beyond the commission stage of Social Insurance.

The question may fairly be raised—Is compulsory insurance democratic? The active opposition of many trade unions, employers and physicians at least accounts for the failure to develop such a scheme in the United States. But in each instance, there seems to be a special reason for the hostility, and a selfish interest that is responsible. At all events, no one would be likely to deny that social insurance

is very much more democratic than charity, and that it is infinitely more useful for the prevention of poverty and misfortune.

Perhaps the best known step in this direction which has been taken in America is the Soldiers' and Sailors' Insurance Act of 1917. This took the place of the time-honored pension system as a means of protecting the families of men who offered their lives for their country. The pensions of earlier times, like the bonuses of today, were degrading and disgraceful. The War Risk Insurance is a straightforward business proposition that inspires self-respect, develops thrift and protects against the proverbial rainy day.

Unfortunately, the administration of the War Risk Insurance has been far from perfect. The commercial Insurance companies have developed gradually and accumulated an invaluable fund of experience. But the Government was faced with the necessity for quickly setting up the complicated machinery to handle an enormous business enterprise. It was inevitable that there should have been delay and confusion. Hence, there has been considerable dissatisfaction especially among those least able to appreciate the difficulties under which the Bureau was working. Nevertheless, it seems likely that the United States Government is in the insurance busness to stay.

THE COÖPERATIVE MOVEMENT

Another movement which is contributing to the solution of the economic problems with which social workers have to deal is the growth of coöperation, especially among consumers. Potentially it is a powerful enemy of the high cost of living and a preventive of poverty, but to the present time it does not seem to have made much progress in the United States.

The initiation of the coöperative movement is usually credited to the beginning made about a hundred years ago under the guidance of Robert Owen in England. But it is probably best known in the form of the retail stores of the Rochdale system. This scheme of consumers' coöperation has been eminently successful in England, and similar associations have had noteworthy growth on the Continent. In the United States, however, it has made much less headway. Probably the reasons are the greater mobility of our population, and national habits of wastefulness and inattention to small economies, the consequent lack of savings from which to provide capital, and the opposition of both retail and wholesale merchants.

Coöperation has been by no means limited to the retail business. In Great Britain, in particular, there have been developed wholesale societies, and the consumers' organizations have entered upon coöperative production. These likewise have been exceedingly successful in Great Britain, but have had very little development in America. One recent example which has aroused considerable attention has been the effort of railway train-men to purchase coöperatively or manufacture such things as overalls and gloves.

Producers' coöperation seems to date back to the time of the American Revolution. It, too, like the organization of the consumers, had its origin in Great Britain and seems to have been most successful in that country, though it has made definite progress in France as well. Many experiments have been made, and a relatively small number of successes have been bought at the expense of numerous failures. Nevertheless, the movement seems to have made substantial though slow progress in the two countries named. This plan for the management of industry entirely by the workmen has made very little headway in the United States, doubtless for reasons similar to

those which have obstructed the development of consumers' coöperation.

Other forms of coöperation are Discount Societies and Credit Unions. The Discount Societies do not sell on their own account, but obtain reductions from traders in consideration of the steady custom of their members. This plan has frequently been adopted by Mutual Aid Societies and by farmers' organizations. The Credit Unions seem to have attained their largest development in the European countries, particularly among the smaller peasant farmers. Roughly, the plan is that of a group of men joining together for the purpose of borrowing a considerable sum on their joint security, each one securing his share of the sum borrowed and assuming his responsibility for the payment of the whole sum.

Similar to the Credit Unions are the Building and Loan Associations, which are used almost exclusively to enable members to acquire homes. These organizations have so far achieved greater results in the United States than all the other forms of coöperation named. But while they have doubtless aided many of the so-called "working class" to obtain homes, they seem to be patronized more often by small business and professional men and salaried folk. Moreover, the chief commercial profit appears to go to outside investors who do not intend to borrow from the associations. Also, there is ground for belief that in some cities these organizations have been manipulated by real estate dealers and building contractors.

"SOCIALIZED" EDUCATION

Another type of preventive activity has been developing the last few years within the field of formal education. For lack of a more specific term it may be called "socialized" education. By this we have in mind compulsory attendance, vocational guidance and train-

ing including instruction in domestic arts, part-time and continuation classes, school hygiene, the teaching of civics, wider use of the school plant for recreation, community organization, and adult instruction, and finally the new viewpoint represented by such advocates as John Dewey.

It certainly would be erroneous to say that all these innovations are being made for the purpose of preventing poverty and other forms of maladjustment. The motive back of them is quite as much constructive as preventive, in the sense in which we are using these terms. In fact, definite results have been accomplished in both directions.

Social workers have always been finding people whose income is inadequate or who are subject to exploitation because of ignorance, which in turn may be traced to inadequate schooling. This represents one of the difficulties at which the compulsory attendance laws have been aimed. But it has been found that it is not enough to keep children in school. They must have the sort of education that meets their particular needs. Many of them must be ready by the time they are fourteen or fifteen to take their places as wage-earners. So the rise of vocational guidance and vocational education has been natural and necessary. Again, some children seem unable to make progress in the ordinary classes and others are found to be definitely subnormal. The identification of these individuals during the school years is important both for them and for society.

All these things contribute directly toward the adjustment of the individual to his social environment, which is after all the very heart of the social worker's task. Other aspects of the "socialization" of the curriculum are working toward the same end. Instead of teaching as civics merely the anatomy of American government, many schools are introducing concrete discussions of live com-

munity problems. Instead of working exclusively at separate tasks, pupils are being taught to coöperate in their studies. Student self-government and organized recreation also contribute to the social education of the young. Taken together, these help the individual to find his place in the community and develop a sense of team-play and civic responsibility.

Finally we should note the wider use of school plants through the introduction of night schools, classes for adults, supervised playgrounds, dances, entertainments, dramatic clubs and libraries. The school is coming to take a larger part in the community life. Such activities as these not only help to prevent illiteracy and ignorance, but are instrumental in providing healthy interests and cultivating a desire for things worth while.

It must be clear to every thinking person that the socialization of education in the directions suggested above must have a very large part in preventing those many ills with which the social worker is asked to cope. If only people knew how to take care of their bodies, how to choose an occupation and prepare themselves for it, and how to play their part as citizens, many of the difficulties of the practical social worker would be greatly reduced.

CAUSES OF INTEREST IN PREVENTION

THE FAILURE OF CHARITY

One of the fundamental reasons for increasing attention to the prevention of social maladjustment has been a growing recognition of the inadequacy of the old-fashioned charity. Without question, indiscriminate almsgiving has pauperized many and has frequently created a veritable profession of begging. To be sure, the civilized world had pretty generally eliminated large scale doles like those which disgraced Greece and Rome, and which ap-

peared at many a monastery during the middle ages, but the ravages of war have brought back something which may easily degenerate into just such promiscuous largesses as those of bygone centuries. Moreover, we have had for many years in America that distinctive figure, the "hobo," and surely the back door "hand-outs" have not contributed anything toward the rehabilitation of this care-free wanderer. Furthermore, it is obvious to all thinking people that the habits of feeding the tramp, of dropping quarters in the blind man's hat, and similar indiscriminate alms, are a curse rather than a blessing.

In the second place, the old-fashioned charity has failed in that it gave attention only to those who were already in trouble, and usually overlooked the sources from which the trouble came and from which similar trouble was sure to continue to come unless those sources were discovered and eliminated. The attitude apparently was that of assuming "the poor ye have always with you." Providence was held responsible for sending the poor, and it was not for mere man to inquire into the reason for their distress. Even in our own day, corporations have established welfare departments to disburse medicine to the sick and comfort to the bereaved, and have simultaneously fought legislative measures designed to prevent occupational diseases and accidents. We Americans have not thought this matter through very carefully, but others have reasoned that the most perfect system of poor relief that might ever be devised would not eliminate poverty. They have come to suspect that it might not even reduce it to any great extent.

A third reason for the failure of the traditional philanthropy has been the general limitation of its attention to individual problems. This narrowness is less true of modern "case work" than of medieval almsgiving, but it

still restricts the usefulness of many charity organization societies. Indeed, it seems to be the attitude of many case workers that the way of salvation lies chiefly through the rehabilitation of individual families, and that programs of community work and of national reorganization are of secondary importance. Fortunately, this one-sidedness is being overcome, and it is being recognized that correlated with case work there must be movements whose objects of attention are not the individual nor the family, but the community, the state, or the nation, or even a league of nations.

Very often charity as such has failed because it is undemocratic and implies a caste order of society. In an earlier day, it regarded the presence of poor people not merely as unavoidable, but as a public asset. Their existence made possible the practice by the well-to-do of the Christian virtue of charity. The giving of alms increased one's pride and self-respect. Sometimes, it helped one to achieve social or political preferment. Not infrequently the gifts of the wealthy were offered with the hope of silencing the demands for thoroughgoing reforms of fundamental wrongs.. Not infrequently the motive was merely a cowardly desire to escape the repulsive presence of misery, or a sentimental self-indulgence in so-called "doing good."

On the other hand, it is only fair to recognize that even the crudest charity has relieved much suffering, and that modern organized charity has succeeded in helping a multitude of needy persons to positions of self-support and self-respect. But even granting this, it is clear to every thinking social worker that charity alone is inadequate, particularly from the viewpoint of preventive and constructive effort.

The traditional charity, therefore, has failed. It has

failed because its indiscriminate alms have encouraged beggars and produced paupers. Its limited vision, which saw only those who were already in trouble, has failed to stop the source of supply. By attending only to individual problems, and by magnifying case work, it has overlooked opportunities for community organization and constructive legislation. By accepting "the poor" as a separate grade in the social hierarchy, it has obstructed the democratic movement.

THE DEMOCRATIC MOVEMENT

Now if the first cause for a transition from cure to prevention has been the failure of the traditional philanthropy, the second cause has been the growing impetus of the democratic movement. This has emphasised itself in a great variety of ways. In the early part of the nineteenth century it appeared in the agitation of the abolitionists, and finally succeeded in sweeping away the institution of human slavery. A little later, it showed itself in the widespread effort to provide universal, free education. The public school system of the United States is one of the most potent factors both as cause and as result of the democratic movement. A third aspect of this development has been the extension of the franchise. When our Constitution was adopted, a rather small number of men had the right to participate in our government. Gradually, the franchise was extended to all adult white men later to the negroes; and now it has been granted to women.

But still more striking has been the growth of trade unionism, both in Europe and in America. Undemocratic though they may be in many respects, the unions have contributed powerfully toward the forcing of recognition for those who previously had been ignored and exploited. Exclusive and narrow though they frequently are, the unions

have done much to provide wider opportunities for those who have constituted our "disadvantaged classes." But more than that, the trade unions are resentful toward philanthropy and extremely suspicious of social workers. They feel keenly the undemocratic character of charity. They have learned to fight the employer who robs them with one hand and doles out alms with the other. They will have nothing of the philanthropy which is a mere sop to keep them from asking for something more significant.

But even more vigorously opposed to the old-fashioned charity are the socialists and kindred groups. Too often have they seen palliative measures introduced as a means of thwarting efforts for fundamental reform of serious evils. So wrought up have they frequently been under such experiences as these that they not merely are suspicious of the Ladies Bountiful and employers' welfare workers, they frequently resent and despise all sorts of social workers.

Our purpose here is not to justify nor to condemn the socialists or the trade unionists. It is simply to call attention to their resentment and to the inflence which they have unquestionably had in changing the spirit and purpose of social work. By refusing the "hand-me-downs" of the rich, and spitting upon the condescending humanitarian, they are unconsciously helping to make social work a profession devoted not only to the alleviation but even more to the elimination of social ills.

DEVELOPMENT OF MODERN SCIENCE

We have seen that the old-fashioned charity has failed largely because it is not preventive, and often is not even curative but only palliative. The democratic movement is demanding something more fundamental. It is calling for radical reform of social evils, *i.e.*, a going to the very roots of the matter and sparing nothing which may be involved in

the difficulty. It is modern science that provides the means of doing the preventive work in which charity has failed, and for which democracy is calling. No matter how clearly men have seen the inadequacy of philanthropy, no matter how keenly they may have desired to remove the sources of difficulty, they could not make much progress without the aid of science. How could they have prevented typhoid fever without the germ theory of disease? How could they have prevented recurrent famines without scientific agriculture?

Chemistry, bacteriology, neurology and the other physical sciences have furnished us with information and with specific means whereby we are enabled to prevent numerous diseases. These sciences have given us vaccination, which has almost wiped out small-pox from the midst of civilized people. They have given us inoculation against typhoid fever, which was responsible for the great difference between the health of army camps in 1917-18 and those of the Spanish-American War. Science has furnished us with prophylactics against venereal diseases, and indirectly the means of checking paresis. By establishing the connection between mosquitoes and malaria and yellow fever, it has enabled us to control these dreaded diseases. Through the study of heredity and the development of vasectomy and tubectomy, we have been provided with means of sterilizing the unfit and checking in part the supply of mental defects.

But not less important than the special measures placed at our disposal by physical science, has been the attitude which it has developed. In so far as men are imbued with the scientific spirit, they are free from prejudice and superstition. They face their difficulties frankly, seek remedies for them, and test these proposed remedies ruthlessly by observation and experiment. As scientists, they are disinterested. They are as ready to discard a theory of their

own as that of some rival school. Theirs is a pragmatic philosophy in the best sense of the word.

Now these attitudes developed first in the realm of physical science. Perhaps this was because man's attention was on the conquering of new continents and the improvement of industrial processes before it was centered upon human relations. But there is little question that the control of nature and solution of problems in the physical environment encouraged belief in the possibility of controlling human relations and solving problems of the social environment. If disease could be cured and even prevented, why not poverty or delinquency? Thus the successes of physical science stimulated the development of social science.

The theory of evolution likewise played a part in the rise of social science, the extent of which is not likely to be overestimated. The knowledge that men's bodies had developed out of previous forms suggested that perhaps their institutions were similarly the product of a long process of evolution. Once it became clear that government, industry, religion, morals, family relations and social organization in general had not always been what they are today, it was but natural to raise the question: Why not make them something different tomorrow?

Just as the physical sciences have developed techniques of observation and experiment for going to the root of their various problems, so have the social sciences undertaken to study the underlying causes of social maladjustment and disorganization. From the studies of Charles Booth, in London, to the latest report of some social insurance commission, there has been a seeking after the causes of poverty and means of their elimination. The Children's Bureau, the Russell Sage Foundation, and many lesser groups, have been studying those factors in our common life which cast a blight upon childhood, and pos-

sible measures for their removal. In fact, there is no end today of investigating, surveying and otherwise seeking after the source of difficulties in the relations between people.

Less immediately practical, but perhaps more important in the long run, have been the studies of such men as Cooley, Thomas, Mead and others, relating to the basis of social organization and the causes of its disruption. After all, social work is fundamentally a dealing with the attitudes and relations of people. And because this is so, the contribution of the social psychologist to practical social work is proving unexpectedly valuable. In another way is social science laying a foundation for more adequate social work. In pointing out and describing the unity of the social process, such men as Dewey, Small and Marshall have shown the impossibility of dealing with one social problem without affecting many phases of the common life. They are teaching the social workers that they cannot meet the needs of an individual or family without considering the neighborhood, the community, or the state.

Thus in manifold ways modern science, both physical and social, is making it possible for social work to answer the challenge of the democratic movement that philanthropy is a failure. The outstanding causes, therefore, of the present tendency to emphasize prevention rather than cure are the failure of the old-fashioned charity, the growing impetus of democracy, and the techniques and viewpoints of modern science.

CONSTRUCTIVE POSSIBILITIES

But all the time we have been discussing the various preventive methods and agencies, the reader must have felt that they involve something more than the negative pro-

gram of prevention. As a matter of fact, many of them do have a positive aspect and a forward look, which is only faintly implied in the terminology that we have been using. The public health movement, for example, seems gradually to be outgrowing the stage of preventive medicine and expanding into a plan for increasing people's vitality and efficiency, prolonging life, and enlarging the capacity to enjoy those things which it has to offer.

Public education has gone much farther than the health movement in seeking to build up and construct definite values rather than content itself with the mere prevention of illiteracy, superstition and bigotry. Even vocational education is not thought of primarily as a means of preventing poverty, but as a means of increasing the economic value of people's working power. Recreation is indeed a means of preventing delinquency and other sorts of social disorganization, but its claim upon us is more than this. It supplies something which all of us want. It gives us relaxation; the joy of associating with other people, and competing with them upon a friendly basis, and merges by imperceptible degrees into the noblest forms of art.

Similarly, in the case of labor legislation, social insurance, and the coöperative movement, attention is by no means limited to the things we desire to prevent. It centers equally if not chiefly upon an improved standard of living.

All the way along, it is not the things we want to prevent which seem most important, but the things which we wish to achieve. Frankly, social work in the commonly accepted sense has not got beyond the preventive stage, but there is beginning to be a vision of positive values and the possibilities of constructive effort, which bids fair to revolutionize social work of the future.

SUGGESTED READINGS

The Idea of Prevention

Hollander, Jacob H.: *The Abolition of Poverty.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1914.

Webb, Sidney and Beatrice: *The Prevention of Destitution.* London: Longmans Green, 1912.

The Democratic Movement

Croly, Herbert D.: *Progressive Democracy.* New York: Macmillan, 1914.

McLaughlin, Andrew C.: *Steps in the Development of American Democracy.* New York: *Abingdon Press,* 1920.

Kirkup, Thomas: *A History of Socialism.* London: Black, 1900.

Tufts, James H.: *The Real Business of Living* (especially Part IV). New York: Holt, 1918.

Webb, Sidney and Beatrice: *Industrial Democracy.* London: Longmans Green, 1902.

The Development of Modern Science

Dewe, J. A.: *History of Economics.* Cincinnati: Benziger, 1908.

Small, A. W.: *"Fifty Years of Sociology in the United States." Amer. Jour. Soc.,* 21, 721–864 (May, 1916).

Sedgwick, W. T., and Tyler, H. W.: *A Short History of Science.* New York: Macmillan, 1917.

Todd, Arthur J.: *The Scientific Spirit and Social Work.* New York: Macmillan, 1919.

Williams, Henry S.: *The Story of Nineteenth-Century Science.* New York: Harper, 1900.

The Public Health Movement

Davis, Michael M., and Warner, Andrew R.: *Dispensaries, Their Management and Development.* New York: Macmillan, 1918.

Hill, Hibbert W.: *The New Public Health.* New York: Macmillan, 1916.

Mangold, Geo. B.: *Problems of Child Welfare* (especially pp. 19–204). New York: Macmillan, 1914.

"Socialized" Education

Dewey, John and Evelyn: *Schools of Tomorrow.* New York: Dutton, 1915.

Flexner, Abraham and Bachman, F. P.: *The Gary Schools, a General Account.* New York: General Education Board, 1918.
King, Irving: *Social Aspects of Education.* New York: Macmillan, 1913.
Mangold, Geo. B.: *Op. cit.*, pp. 205–270.

Labor Legislation

Adams, T. S., and Sumner, Helen L.: *Labor Problems.* New York: Macmillan, 1905 (Chap. 12).
Hutchins, B. L., and Harrison, A.: *A History of Factory Legislation.* London: King, 1907.
Kelley, Florence: *Some Ethical Gains Through Legislation.* New York: Macmillan, 1905.

Social Insurance

Frankel, Lee K., and Dawson, Miles M.: *Workingmen's Insurance in Europe.* New York: Charities Publication Committee, 1910.
Illinois Health Insurance Commission Report. Springfield, 1919.
Seager, Henry R.: *Social Insurance.* New York: Macmillan, 1910.

The Coöperative Movement

Adams, T. S., and Sumner, Helen, L.: *Op. cit.*, Chap. 10.
Fay, Chas. R.: *Coöperation at Home and Abroad.* London: King, 1908.
Ford, James: *Coöperation in New England.* New York: Survey Associates, 1913.

Mohammad Amin Mughal

PART II

NINETEENTH CENTURY HUMANITARIANISM

CHAPTER IV

THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION AND SOCIAL WORK

So far our study has been of the present and the recent past with an effort to anticipate the future. Throughout the discussion we have been dealing with phases of a transition from humanitarianism to democracy, from philanthropy to professional service. We shall undertake now to clarify, and, indeed, to test our interpretation in the light of that humanitarianism and philanthropy which characterized social work of the nineteenth century.

Briefly and simply put, our thesis is that the distinctive features of nineteenth century social work were a part of the response to needs which appeared in the Industrial Revolution; that its distinctive spirit and methods are also traceable to that series of economic and social changes. To describe and account for the Industrial Revolution here would carry us beyond our present purpose, but it does seem important to review rapidly some of its outstanding features, in order that we may appreciate somewhat the tasks and the motives lying back of industrial welfare work, charity organization, social settlements and housing reform.

THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

Two hundred years ago industry was characterized by the "domestic system." That is, manufacturing was for the most part carried on in the homes of workmen or in small shops near by, where almost all the processes were performed by hand. In spite of these limitations, production was on the increase, particularly in the woolen industry of

England, where the Industrial Revolution first appeared. This was in part at least a response to the demand for something to exchange for the goods of the Orient.

Presently the importation of cotton goods from India became a matter of serious competition with the woolens. People were using cotton more and more in place of wool. Hence a barrier was set up in the form of a protective tariff against the competing cloth from India. But an unexpected outcome of this move was the development of a domestic cotton industry.

From our present point of view, the most important aspect of the new manufacture of cotton was its relative freedom from the restrictions of gild rules and merchantilistic legislation. The older trades and industries were minutely regulated either by the craftsmen themselves or by governments eagerly seeking a "favorable balance of trade." Being new, the cotton industry was much freer to develop in accordance with changing needs. Hence we find that remarkable series of inventions: the fly-shuttle, spinning jenny, water frame, Crompton's "mule," power loom and cotton gin. All these came out of the efforts of countless workmen to improve and adjust the various processes involved in the manufacture of cotton goods, and made their appearance during the latter part of the eighteenth century in England.

At the same time the metal trades were undergoing an equally important transformation. Previously the smelting of iron ore and the manufacture of its products were carried on with charcoal. But the forests of England were being depleted and it became necessary to make use of a new fuel, coal. Now the use of coal compelled the manufacturerers to alter their equipment and their processes. The manufacture of machinery itself and the use of coal for other purposes followed. Presently there appeared the

steam engine, steam hammer, the Bessemer process, steamboat, locomotive, steam press, etc.

It was largely through these series of inventions that the making of goods by hand in the home gave way to large-scale manufacture in factories. The new machines were so heavy and so complicated that special buildings had to be erected for them. Moreover, the economical use of power required that it be applied to many machines at once. Now factories were not absolutely new, but until the development of power machinery there was not sufficient advantage in the factory to overcome the opposition of the workmen, who naturally preferred the independence of home industry. But through the eighteenth century inventions the factory system rapidly gained the ascendency, though not without strenuous opposition from the hand spinners and weavers.

In order that the new factories might be properly manned, it was necessary to bring together large numbers of workers. Under the domestic system manufacturing could be carried on in the open country and in small villages. But the existence of a factory had as its corollary a town or a city, and the growth of these industrial centers was one of the marked features of the nineteenth century. In 1800 London was the only city in England with a population of 100,000, and including London only 17 per cent. of the population lived in places of 20,000 and over. But by the middle of the century this proportion had jumped to 35 per cent., and by its close to nearly 60 per cent. In 1800 the largest city of the United States was Philadelphia with a population of about 70,000, and there were only five cities with more than 10,000 inhabitants. But today there are about ten metropolitan areas with over one million inhabitants each, and one fourth of the entire population of the United States lives in cities of more than 100,000 in-

habitants. Similar developments are to be traced in France, Germany, Italy and the other great industrial countries.

Where then did the new manufacturers secure their workmen? In England there were three important sources of supply. One was the rural folk who were crowded off the great estates in the course of what are known as the "enclosures." These were the consolidation of small holdings either to substitute the pasturing of sheep for the raising of crops or, more frequently in the eighteenth century to make possible improved methods of agriculture. In either case, many farm laborers and renters were dispossessed and forced to look elsewhere for a living. The second source was the laborers left stranded by the breakdown of the gilds. The third important source of labor was the charities. In almshouses and orphanages there were thousands of "pauper" children and adults whom those in control were only too glad to dispose of.

What made the work of these "paupers" and other unskilled folk more valuable than ever before was the division of labor and simplification of tasks in the factories. Whereas before, every workman had a variety of duties, under the new conditions he was likely to be assigned to one single step in the process. This made it possible and profitable to utilize the labor of little children and unskilled adults. Of course, such a change meant that the day's work was more monotonous and that "real wages" —as distinguished from cash wages—were often decreased. It meant also that workers could be moved readily from factory to factory, because processes were more and more standardized. With the increase of working forces it meant the substitution of numbers for names and the loss of personal contact between employers and employes, the depersonalizing of industry.

The displacement of domestic industries by factories

meant that it was less and less possible for individual workmen to own the means of production. Even under the domestic system many weavers used looms which were owned by someone else. They frequently worked up wool for a merchant-middleman who owned the raw material and disposed of the finished product. But in the factory the workman was essentially part of the plant. He did not supply the raw material or the tools to work with. The place in which he worked belonged to others and others sold the finished product. The workman was thoroughly dependent upon the employer for the means of making a living.

Now the obvious reason for this was the very great expense involved in building, equipping and operating a factory. No ordinary workman could provide the necessary capital. Hence the factories were built by those individuals who already had means or by corporations. Thus capitalism was given a tremendous stimulus. This again was not new, but it was only through the Industrial Revolution that it came to dominate the economic system.

Capitalism meant preëminently three things. It meant that people who themselves had nothing to do with the processes of production could invest their money through the impersonal corporation. It meant the substitution of gain for enjoyment as the purpose of industry, for the only object of the corporation is to earn dividends for its stockholders. It meant the piling up of wealth in the hands of a few and the much slower advancement, if not the actual impoverishment of the many.

Along with this went the development of two classes in society, the industrial bourgeoisie and the proletariat. Previously the important social classes had been the nobility, clergy and peasantry, with a growing number of merchants and artizans. Power had been vested chiefly

in the nobility. But now the "middle class" came more and more to the front in business, and through its economic strength gradually achieved political ascendency. Dependent upon it, and later in powerful opposition to it, appeared the "working class."

THE RISE OF THE MIDDLE CLASS

The terms "middle class" and "bourgeoisie" are used with varying connotation and hence do not have any very exact meaning. However, they represent, in general, city folk as contrasted with the landed gentry, employers as contrasted with employes, people whose incomes are derived from investments as contrasted with wage-earners. These classifications overlap, but do not coincide; neither do they make clear the inclusion of the professional folk who are usually grouped with the bourgeoisie. Nevertheless, the terms bourgeoisie and middle class do have a significance, recognized in common parlance, which is sufficient to justify their use here.

Just as the whole Industrial Revolution was a gradual transition, so the rise of the middle class was not sudden or spectacular. With the substitution of buying and selling for barter, and the appearance of middlemen doing business definitely for profits, the thirteenth century presented the beginnings of a bourgeoisie. But it remained for the eighteenth and nineteenth to make the bourgeiosie not merely important but dominant in the economic order.

The achievements of the middle class in politics were only a little less striking than those in the realm of business. Having won a place in the industrial world through energy and determination, the merchants and manufacturers naturally felt themselves to be more important to the nation than the old-fashioned feudal nobles. But over and above this natural ambition for political power, there

were economic motives. The "captains of industry" were anxious to be rid of the merchantilist regulations which proved quite burdensome to the new methods of manufacture. In the second place, the factory owners wanted political power in order to control the working people. They wanted everything to be in their own hands. Hence they emphasized the economic doctrine of "*laissez-faire*" or non-interference in business.

American politics have been essentially middle class from the start, but particularly so since the Civil War, for it is only in the last half century that the United States has come to be characteristically a manufacturing country. One of the most striking achievements of the American commercial and industrial folk has been the creation and maintenance of high tariff walls "for the protection of infant industries." More recently their influence has manifested itself in the war-time legislation, under which freedom of speech, freedom of the press and even freedom of opinion and political affiliation have been interfered with, when not actually suppressed. The wholesale arrests and deportations, the expulsion of socialists from legislatures, and attempts to prevent the founding of a "third party" are extreme efforts of the bourgeoisie to control government.

Having thus attained political power directly or indirectly the middle class has utilized this power to bring about numerous results. In the first place, it has secured legislation directly favorable to private industry and commerce. This has included the maintenance of "law and order," advantageous corporation laws, the granting of franchises and even public subsidies to private business. It has sought the readjustment of taxation systems so as to remove the burden so far as possible from the shoulders of business.

Along with these achievements of business in politics has come a new era of imperialism, in which business men have succeeded in identifying their desire for new markets and for new fields for investment of their surplus capital with very real national longings to have particular flags wave over as large expanses of the world's surface as possible. This imperialism which has been assiduously cultivated by the business interests on the assumption that "trade follows the flag," was probably an important cause of the recent war. Of course, an inevitable accompaniment of this new imperialism was the development of militarism.

During the last fifty years there have been built up in Europe and America the greatest armies and navies that the world has ever seen. While the demand for them may have arisen out of a more or less genuine patriotism, this demand has been actively stimulated by a great number of the middle class who regard militarism not only as a kind of public insurance against the attacks of other nations upon their colonies, commerce and industry, but also as a guarantee of the maintenance of the capitalistic system. Indeed, they have counted largely upon military training to breed a servile spirit. They have utilized the militia and other armed forces to suppress strikes and various radical demonstrations. They have depended upon the military band and flag-waving so to stir the emotions of the populace that differences of opinion concerning important domestic policies might be forgotten amid the excitement over some real or fancied external aggression.

THE CONFLICT OF CLASSES

Over against the commercial and industrial bourgeoisie has arisen a proletariat, more and more organized to demand a share in the control and the proceeds of industry.

The workers' mobilization for this class conflict has in general taken two forms, trade unionism and socialism. These have been essentially fighting doctrines. They have emphasized the divergence of interests between the capitalists and the workers.

The trade unions have on the whole accepted the existing system of industry, and have devoted themselves to securing a larger share of its returns. They represent the principle of collective bargaining, and have used their combined strength to secure shorter hours, higher wages and other conditions which they regard as desirable. In England the trade unions have come of late to include the vast majority of people who work for wages, but in the United States they represent a small minority drawn chiefly from the more skilled trades. Through the use of their most powerful weapons, the strike and the boycott, they have compelled employers to accede to many of their demands..

The socialists, in contrast to the trade unionists, do not accept the capitalistic system of industry, but desire to see it displaced as rapidly as possible by something more democratic. They deny the axiom of the orthodox economists of the nineteenth century that private profit coincides with social gain. They maintain that capitalism is inefficient in the production of material goods and is still more destructive of human values. While socialists demand collective ownership of the great bodies of capital they usually approve of the private ownership of homes, and the contents of homes. The communists go further. In 1847 the Communist League was organized in London. The first article of its constitution stated that "The aim of the League is the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, the rule of the proletariat, the abolition of the old society resting on class antagonisms, and the founding of a new society

without classes and without private property." The specific aims of socialists have differed widely in different times and places. But they stand for a fundamental reorganization of the economic system, either by evolution or revolution, which will introduce into industry at least as much democracy as has been achieved in the political system.

THE TASKS OF SOCIAL WORK

The Industrial Revolution brought in its train a host of new problems pressing for solution. The insanitary factories, crowded houses, long hours, low wages, employment of women and young children, periods of industrial depression accompanied by unemployment and monotonous existence broken by periodical "sprees" presented a real challenge to those interested in the welfare of their fellow men. But these were not all. Along with them came the break-down of customs, habits and morals. There was a general social disorganization.

On the rural estates and in the domestic industries families lived and worked as units. The members worked together, played together, in fact, lived together in the most complete way possible. But in the factory towns, they had different tasks, different pleasures, different associates. Home became mainly a place in which to eat and sleep. The absence of the mother or the presence of boarders further destroyed the unity of family life.

Community life, too, suffered disorganization. Before the growth of cities most people lived in genuine communities wherein personal relations were only a little less intimate than within the family. Everyone knew everyone else, his business and his family history. But in the new towns and cities people lived next door to each other without being neighbors. They came together from places widely separated and moved about so much that no neighborhood or community life could well develop.

Under the simpler conditions there was a single moral code which was generally accepted as "the right." But in the more complex agglomerations people were continually coming in contact with new "mores." They had to learn to get along with people whose ethical principles were very different from their own. Some came to question not merely their own code, but the possibility of there being any absolute distinction between right and wrong. Some doubtless thought their way through to the "relativity of moral judgments," but the majority either clung to their old ways or simply drifted.

The mobility of the population meant inevitably the necessity for constant adjustment to new sets of people and new conditions of living. The standardization of industrial processes, the improved means of transportation, periods of industrial depression and unemployment and a growing spirit of unrest set the population in motion, increased friction and necessitated continuous readjustment. The loss of personal relations in industry and the separate residence sections for bourgeoisie and proletariat have widened the gulf of misunderstanding. Finally the organized class conflict has made the problems of adjusting personal relations in modern society well-nigh insoluble.

The recognized tasks then which the Industrial Revolution set for nineteenth century social work included: the protection of health through sanitation of factories, housing and medical service; provision of regular employment with adequate remuneration; provision for disability and old age; protection of children; education; recreation. But all these were in fact subsidiary to the finding of a new basis for social organization. The old order had disappeared. Before a new one could come into being there was an inevitable period of disorganization and confusion. To make the most obviously necessary adjustments

was the task set before the social workers of the nineteenth century.

NINETEENTH CENTURY HUMANITARIANISM

The responses to this new situation were varied. One of the first was the revolt of the exploited victims of the new factory system. The working people began to organize, as we have seen, for the removal of their own disabilities. Another response consisted in the enactment of "social legislation," laws for the protection of the "disadvantaged classes." This legislation was the result of agitation partly by the workers themselves, partly by their philanthropic friends. Finally there was the organization of social work by middle class "uplifters."

Ecclesiastical and public poor relief had been long in existence. Now they were continued and extended. But in the course of the nineteenth century there arose a group of private, non-sectarian charities supported and administered by bourgeois philanthropists. The industrial welfare work, charity organization societies, settlements and housing reform that appeared in the nineteenth century were essentially the contribution of the bourgeoisie to social work. Others of their contributions were the new interest in foreign missions, abolition of human slavery, non-sectarian education and prison reform.

Not only did the middle class develop these new philanthropies; they came to dominate many of the older charities as well. Indeed, it was only natural that the class which had newly come to power in business and politics should presently exercise a determining influence in the field of social work. The middle class folk had the money and the leisure.

The motives which led them to participate in humanitarian movements were varied. Perhaps most often it

was a genuine desire to help, frequently coupled, however, with an unwillingness to "mix philanthropy and business." That is, the merchants and manufacturers were willing to make donations to hospitals, libraries, schools, playgrounds and charitable societies, so long as there was no attempt to disturb business relations. They were willing out of the abundance of their own wealth to make gifts to their less fortunate fellows, but were not willing to yield any part of the control to those who wished to help themselves. This motive was one of philanthropy, in contrast to democracy. The product was "uplift" work in the most exact sense of the term.

Another, and less honorable, motive was the desire to "keep the workers contented." Many a business man has offered his employes a clubhouse, moderate-priced dwellings, a bonus, or a share in the profits, with the hope of forestalling union organization, a minimum wage or a shorter working day. Not a few gifts to charity have been part of an effort to make the feudalism of industry benevolent and therefore acceptable, but at the same time to preserve its feudal status. The ideal of these pseudo-philanthropists has been a benevolent despotism as a means of preventing the growth of democracy.

Perhaps the forcing of charity outside the ordinary relationships of the business world was one cause of the sentimentalism which has been characteristic of much philanthropic work. This spirit has been particularly marked among the women folk of the bourgeoisie, who have been even farther removed from the vital relations of the economic system. Hence we have Lady Bountiful going down with her basket of groceries or visiting the poor in her limousine. It is this sentimentalism that marks the immediate emotional response to the appeal of the beggar. It appears in tag-days, Christmas dinners for the poor, and

newspaper appeals for the "hundred neediest families."

The new philanthropies of the nineteenth century afforded unlimited opportunities for social climbers and political opportunists. To be chairman of some committee, to have one's name on a letter-head, to get one's picture in the daily paper—these have all too often been the purposes of ostensibly charitable individuals. For those who have already "arrived" socially, it has been a matter of following the fashions of the smart set. If the medieval folk who kissed the feet of lepers were performing a religious rite, these nineteenth century sponsors of charity balls were performing a "social rite."

But after we have eliminated the social climbers, the cheap politicians, the "sob sisters," the Ladies Bountiful, the *poseurs,* and given recognition to the truly benevolent bourgeoisie, there remains a small body of earnest, honest democrats, making it their chief business to seek solutions for problems of the common welfare. In social work of the nineteenth century these were probably in the minority. Perhaps they still are. For them social work was not charity, but public service; not an interesting diversion for spare time, but a profession, a "man's job."

SUGGESTED READINGS

Allsopp, Henry: *An Introduction to English Industrial History.* London: Bell, 1913.

Ashley, W. J.: *The Economic Organization of England.* London: Longmans Green, 1914. Lectures 7 and 8.

Beard, Chas.: *The Industrial Revolution.* London: Swan Sonnenschein, 1901.

Bogart, Ernest L.: *Economic History of the United States.* New York: Longmans Green, 1907. Chapters 11 and 12.

Chapin, F. Stuart: *An Historical Introduction to Social Economy.* New York: Century, 1917, Part 4.

Engels, Frederick: *The Condition of the Working-Class in England in 1844.* London, 1892.

Gretton, R. H.: *The English Middle Class.* London: Bell, 1917.
Hammond, J. L., and Barbara: *The Village Labourer, 1760–1832.* London: Longmans Green, 1911.
Hayes, Carlton, J. H.: *A Political and Social History of Modern Europe.* New York: Macmillan, 1916, Chap. 18. See also index under "Bourgeoisie."
MacGregor, D. H.: *The Evolution of Industry.* Home University Library, 1912.
Perris, Geo. H.: *Industrial History of Modern England.* New York, 1914.
Rosenblatt, Frank F.: *Social and Economic Aspects of the Chartist Movement.* New York: Columbia University, 1916.
Sombart, Werner: *Socialism and the Social Movement.* New York: 1898.
Toynbee, Arnold: *Lectures on the Industrial Revolution of the Eighteenth Century in England.* London: Longmans Green, 1884.
Veblen, Thorstein: *The Theory of the Leisure Class.* New York: Macmillan, 1899.
Weber, A. F.: *The Growth of Cities in the Nineteenth Century.* New York: Columbia University, 1899.

CHAPTER V

INDUSTRIAL WELFARE WORK

THE physical and social problems which arose out of the Industrial Revolution impressed themselves first upon the new manufacturers, for the welfare of the workers was closely bound up with discipline and efficiency in the factory. Very often, to be sure, it was a narrow and short-sighted interest in the workers, but there were from the beginning of the nineteenth century genuine philanthropists who, not having seen the vision of industrial democracy, honestly devoted themselves to the uplift of their workmen.

At its best, industrial welfare work is something done by employers for their employes because of a real humanitarian interest in the workmen for their own sake, philanthropic in spirit, though undemocratic in method. At its worst, it is a scheme for more complete control of the working people by the owners of industry, a mere camouflage for exploitation.

As we hurriedly review the course of industrial welfare work in the nineteenth century we shall find all sorts of variations, but in general we shall see a gradual increase in the degree of participation by employes in the planning and administering of schemes for the promotion of their welfare. We shall find industrial welfare work, in the sense of "anything for the comfort and improvement of the employes, which is not a necessity of the industry nor required by law," giving way to (1) managerial attention to safety, health, education, etc., for the frankly avowed purpose of business success, (2) govern-

mental regulation of factories and administration of insurance funds, etc., (3) independent organization of working people for self-advancement.

EARLY DEVELOPMENT

GREAT BRITAIN

It was natural that industrial welfare work should first appear in England, for it was in that country that the factory system first developed. What we call the Industrial Revolution of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century took place in England fully fifty years before it got under way in any other country. It is really since the Civil War that the United States has become an industrial nation.

After the invention of the spinning jenny, the "mule," the cotton gin, the steam engine, and the other machines that made possible large-scale production of cloth, factories grew up like mushrooms in England. The people swarmed into the new industrial towns more rapidly than provision could be made for their living accommodations. Hence, they had to live in fearfully crowded quarters, without sanitary facilities or privacy. Many of the new factory operatives came from small villages or the open country where habits of unhygienic and insanitary living did not threaten the lives and health of others, as was bound to be the case in the crowded towns.

The factories themselves were thrown up hastily without adequate provision for light and air. The heat, moisture and dust-laden air occasioned a vast amount of sickness and an unduly high death rate. Then with the division of labor and simplification of individual tasks it became possible and profitable to employ women and

young children in place of men. They were frequently more deft with their fingers and were willing to work for lower wages. The work was strenuous, for "speeding-up" early appeared on the scene, and the hours were long. This meant that boys and girls went early to the human "junk heap," broken in body, mind and spirit.

It was such a situation as this that started Robert Owen on his career as a social reformer. Owen became manager and part owner of the New Lanark mills in Scotland in 1800. Connected with the mills were about two thousand employes, five hundred of whom were children who had been brought at the age of five or six from the poor-houses and charities of Edinburgh and Glasgow. The general condition of the people was very unsatisfactory. Theft, drunkenness and other vices were common; education and sanitation were alike neglected; and most families lived in a single room.

Owen's first efforts were directed toward improving the houses, opening a store where goods of sound quality could be purchased at a little more than cost, supervising the sale of liquor, and teaching habits of thrift, cleanliness and order. He also opened schools for the young children. Though at first regarded with suspicion by the work people, Owen presently won their confidence. But it was his business associates who interfered most with the plans. Although the mills prospered financially, the partners were displeased with the expenditures on behalf of the employes, and entered much complaint.

Wearied at last by their restrictions, Owen formed a new company in 1813. The members of the firm were content with a return of five per cent. on their capital and were ready to give special attention to the welfare of their workmen. Under this regime New Lanark became widely known, and was much visited by social reformers and

statesmen. According to the testimony of all, the results were most gratifying.

It would be quite impossible to trace in detail the growth of this idea. Instead, we shall cite a few instances and show the character of the welfare work undertaken by different corporations.

The reports of the factory inspectors for 1845 tell of a corporation described as the "N.S.M. Co.," which employed 854 persons. Each employe receiving more than 4s. per week contributed 1d. which was used to pay a surgeon who visited the factory daily and also attended the sick in their homes. Two hundred factory children and children of employes attended school daily, and 40 to 50 attended night school. In addition, there was religious instruction, a library of 300 volumes, a brass band, a savings bank and a fire brigade. All who "give satisfactory proof of being in the habit of attending some place of instruction, or of public worship on the Sunday," received free tickets for an annual picnic.

The "Quarterly Review" for December, 1852, describes the welfare work undertaken by another company whose managing director "thought it possible, without loss or hurt to the texture . . . . . to humanise and Christianise the hands." A school was opened in 1848, later there were tea-parties, cricket, gardening, excursions and religious instruction. In 1852 a chaplain was appointed to take charge of these varied activities.

Another company is described in the words of one of its members as beginning its welfare work after the following fashion: "My Grandmother, too, is said by many of the Workpeople to have been very sympathetic with them in times of trouble or illness. She managed a Clothing Club for them, and added a bonus to the money they paid in." This company organized a reading club in 1850,

established a small library, organized a school for the children, arranged outings, started a brass band, singing class, "pantomimes," and fairs, annual teas, and made Christmas gifts. In 1855 a man was appointed "partly to look after the welfare of the workmen and their families." A doctor and nurse were introduced in 1868. In 1874 a woman was added to the staff to work among the girls and women.

THE UNITED STATES

As we have already indicated, employers' welfare work appeared somewhat later in the United States than in England and Scotland. One of the earliest activities of this sort was the provision of suitable housing facilities. Very often there were no houses at all on the site of a proposed establishment and something had to be done. In other cases the dwellings were insufficient in number or unsatisfactory in character.

One of the first American firms to undertake the housing of its employes seems to have been the Peacedale Manufacturing Company of Rhode Island. It erected in 1848 a number of seven- and eight-room cottages and several two- and three-family dwellings with three to eight rooms for each family. These were plain, well-built, comfortable and kept in good repair. The rent was very modest, being as recently as 1907 only $3.50 to $12.50 per month.

The Waltham Watch Company early constructed houses to rent or sell to its employes. In 1865 it established a boarding house, known as "Adams Hall," for female employes. This is still in use. It has double rooms furnished with double bed, table, washstand, chest of drawers and three chairs.

In 1890 the N. O. Nelson Company founded the village

of Leclaire near St. Louis. Employes were encouraged, but not compelled, to purchase homes here. Lots were sold at $2 to $2.50 a front foot, and 6 per cent. interest was charged. The houses were built on plans mutually agreed upon, the employe being charged for raw material, labor and the "average profit" of the company. Monthly payments were from $12 to $20. Five dollars per year was charged for water, and twenty-five cents per month for electric lights.

"The winding cinder roads, bordered with spreading shade trees, the groups of ornamental shrubbery and plants and the carefully cultivated flower beds in and about the factory grounds and parks give the place an attractiveness rarely to be found in a manufacturing community. Employes may here enjoy the advantages of a city with the freedom and economy of country life. All who wish can keep their own poultry and cow, grow their own vegetables and fruits and yet live within easy reach of their place of employment."

In 1878 the Ludlow Manufacturing Associates of Massachusetts began to take an active part in the education of the children of their employes. The village had a one-room, ungraded school, but the increased number of operatives compelled the addition of two teachers, whose classes met in the vestry of the church. The company then built a schoolhouse with six class-rooms, a lecture hall and parlor, which it rented to the town at the nominal figure of $100 per year. There was considerable friction between the town and the company about the management of the school, but the arrangement was continued until about 1905. Later, the Associates started the Ludlow Textile School to train apprentices. Each boy spent five hours each day in the mill. One class went to school in the morning, the other in the afternoon. The company also

arranged three months' courses in cooking for the women and girls. In 1878 it started a library, and in 1888 erected a special building to house it. In this same year it furnished a room and paid the salary of a treasurer for a savings bank.

The first instance we have found recorded of recreation provided by employers is that of the Conant Thread Company, of Rhode Island, which furnished transportation one day in 1870 for its employes to a shore resort on Narragansett Bay. No wages were paid for this day, and the employes were not consulted as to the nature or the place of the excursion.

The Ludlow Associates, mentioned above, in 1878 fitted up a game and smoking room. But it became so disorderly that it was soon closed. In 1895 a new attempt was much more successful. In this case, the employes were given an active share in the planning and administration. A men's club was organized. In 1898 a building was provided and furnished with bowling alleys, pool tables, etc. Later an athletic field was added to the equipment.

The Illinois Steel Company, in 1889, opened at Joliet the "Steel Works Club" for the benefit of its employes. Any workman in the plant was eligible to membership upon payment of the annual dues of $2.00. The building was leased to the club at the nominal rental of $1.00 per year. It has a reading room, billiard room, gymnasium, bowling alleys, hand-ball court, tennis court, etc.

In addition to housing, education and recreation, industrial welfare work early included a miscellaneous lot of activities, some of which have already been suggested. At Peacedale, R. I., in 1854, one of the mill owners and his wife taught children singing on week-days and Bible on Sundays. In 1856 the company set aside a building with

library, reading room and hall. In 1891 it put up a new building with gymnasium, club rooms, hall, library, etc.

In 1886 the Solvay Process Company started a sewing class for girls. Later, it erected a guild house, which had an assembly hall for concerts, entertainments and lectures, billiard and pool rooms, class rooms, library and kitchen. The company also built a club house for use of the office force, and laid out an athletic field.

PRESENT SCOPE OF INDUSTRIAL WELFARE WORK

In 1919 the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics reported the results of its investigation of over 400 establishments which had welfare departments. Three hundred and seventy-five of these had some provision for medical treatment. Some had first-aid equipment only, others had hospital or emergency rooms, about one-third had a doctor and an equal number a nurse. In some cases, definite instruction was being given in first-aid. One very large firm received reports every twelve days about absences. These were then followed up in order that the needed medical attention or other service might be rendered. Physical examinations at the time of employment and periodically thereafter were found in numerous plants.

These health measures have on the whole redounded to the benefit of the employes and the credit of their employers. But it is only fair to remember that the company doctor and the company hospital are frequently devices for defeating workmen's compensation laws and industrial accident insurance. Moreover, they are not always above suspicion as actual sources of income, because of the medical fees which are charged.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics also classes under the head of welfare work, the provision of drinking water

systems, wash-rooms, lockers, hot water, soap and towels, lunch room, milk stations, etc.

Over two hundred establishments were reported as providing rest and recreation rooms. Over one hundred had club houses, or at least club rooms. These were variously equipped with gymnasia, game rooms, athletic grounds, bowling alleys, pool and billiard tables, swimming pools, musical instruments, moving pictures, etc. A few firms had country clubs and camps where employes might spend week-ends and vacations at a minimum of expense. Roof gardens and recreation parks were found occasionally.

The educational opportunities provided by employers took the forms of libraries, reading rooms, classes and lectures. One hundred establishments were found by the Bureau to have libraries, with space, books and attendants provided by the firms. These were in addition to the purely technical libraries which were used almost exclusively for reference purposes as a part of the business. Technical schools, continuation schools, English for foreigners, and all sorts of evening classes were found.

"One company with about 14,000 employes maintains, with the coöperation of the local school board, a technical night school for its employes, in which about 1000 students are enrolled. There are several departments. In the foreign department, classes are held in arithmetic, and also in the reading, speaking and writing of English. The preparatory department has classes in mental arithmetic, shop problems, composition, commercial geography and mechanical drawing. In the engineering department, instruction is given in theoretical and applied electricity, pattern, foundry and machine shop practise, sciences, higher mathematics, etc. There is also a woman's department, giving a commercial course, domestic science,

and music. A moderate tuition fee is charged; the high-school building is used, and the costs above the tuition paid by students are met by the company and the school district, the former paying about three-fourths of the deficit."

Not merely the employes themselves, but their families as well, are frequently included within the scope of industrial welfare work. The Bureau of Labor Statistics found 158 firms "doing more or less social betterment work among their employes' families, generally along the following lines: (1) Improving the dwellings and the streets, installing sewerage, lighting and water systems, and assisting in gardening. (2) Providing educational and recreational facilities. (3) Introducing into the community a nurse or other capable visitor to advise in the care of the sick and the children, to instruct in American methods of home-making, to develop the community spirit by organizing and fostering clubs, and to be the sympathetic friend in time of trouble."

Other forms of welfare work include disability funds, group insurance and pensions. Eighty establishments were found by the Bureau to have benefit associations, to which the firms made substantial contributions. In the majority, the employes were found to have at least a part in the management. In some, membership was a condition of employment, but the majority were voluntary, in theory at least. In nearly all cases membership was forfeited on leaving the employ of the company.

"The establishment of a definite pension system has been a comparatively recent manifestation among employers of the belief that the worker has a just claim on those for whom he works for some provision for his declining years. It is probably true, however, that while the majority of the plans state that the pensions are granted for 'loyal and efficient' service, still the fact that the pro-

vision of these funds tends toward a more stable force, toward keeping the services of the more experienced and skilful workmen who might be able to command higher wages elsewhere, and toward moderating industrial unrest generally, has its weight also in determining firms or corporations to establish such funds." It is interesting to note that in contrast to this moderate statement of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, a member of the United States Supreme Court described these pensions as "the new peonage."

The very essence of employers' welfare work is contained in the definition used by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, viz., "Anything for the comfort and improvement, intellectual or social, of the employes, over and above wages paid, which is not a necessity of the industry nor required by law." In other words, it is regarded essentially as a gratuity. It represents patronage rather than coöperation and benevolence rather than justice. However, so long as industry is continued on a feudal basis and legislation is inadequate, this humanitarianism of the employers must be regarded as praiseworthy, unless, of course, it be used as a means of exploitation.

The opinions of working men in regard to welfare work are divided as is evident from the following statements of two labor leaders, Samuel Gompers and John P. Frey.

The opinion of Samuel Gompers is this: "It should be clearly understood that an employer who employs numbers of workers in his establishments places them under an organization where they individually have no control over environment, and are unable to furnish for themselves even the most necessary things, such as water, toilet provisions, and things of like nature. Any person who is in any degree responsible for the well-being of human beings, cannot with good conscience disregard the

obligation. If he has intelligent imagination and foresight he will refuse to poison the bodies and lungs of the workers, or to permit them to render their product unfit for consumption, to ruin their eyesight or to mutilate their bodies. He will do these things to satisfy his own sense of decency and justice, and anything less would do violence to his conscience and cause him discomfort. Such deeds are not favors, but only a decent respect for humanity. The spurious kind of welfare work, intended only to rob the workers of independence of action and of just compensation, has met with deserved discredit and disrepute. Justice, not charity, is the right of all the workers. Let welfare work become what it should be—conscience work."

According to John P. Frey: "Welfare work chloroforms the worker and gets the better of him. The unionists want to help themselves. They do not want to be the objects of patronage. It is a noticeable thing that welfare work stops when shops become unionized. Shops which give turkeys at Thanksgiving stop giving turkeys after the men form unions, but the men can buy turkeys several times a year, if they care to do so, with the increase in wages. This seems to be evidence that welfare work is used to keep the men from organizing."

Thus it is clear that as bourgeois benevolence industrial welfare work has definite limitations. But it involves many activities that in themselves are desirable and in no wise incompatible with self-respect and democracy. Suppose there were an industrial democracy in the best sense, there would still be need for attention to health, safety, education, recreation, thrift, etc. Only under these conditions the administration of the welfare work would become a specialized service rendered to the group at its own request and paid for by the group. The democratic movement which is unquestionably under way leaves little room

for philanthropy, but makes a large place for professional service.

SUGGESTED READINGS

Bloomfield, Daniel: *Selected Articles on Employment Management.* New York: Wilson, 1919, especially pp. 435–483.

Bloomfield, Meyer: *Management and Men.* London: Unwin, T. Fisher, 1919.

Brandeis, Louis D.: *Business—A Profession.* Boston: Small Maynard, 1914, especially pp. 65–81.

Cadbury, Edward: *Experiments in Industrial Organization.* New York: Longmans Green, 1912.

Feld, R. C.: *Humanizing Industry.* New York: Dutton, 1919.

Frankel, Lee K. and Fleisher, Alex.: *The Human Factor in Industry.* New York: Macmillan, 1920.

Gilman, N. P.: *A Dividend to Labor. A Study of Employers' Welfare Institutions.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1899.

Henderson, Chas. R.: *Citizens in Industry.* New York: Appleton, 1915.

Kellor, Francis A.: *"Industrial Americanization and National Defense." North American Review,* May, 1917.

Meakin, Budgett: *Model Factories and Villages.* Philadelphia: Jacobs, 1905.

Proud, Emily Dorothea: *Welfare Work.* London: G. Bell & Sons, 1916.

Tarbell, Ida M.: *New Ideals in Business.* New York: Macmillan, 1916.

Tead, Ordway and Metcalf, H. C.: *Personnel Administration.* New York: McGraw Hill, 1920.

Tolman, Wm. H.: *Social Engineering.* New York: McGraw, 1909.

U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Bulletin No. 250. *"Welfare Work for Employees in Industrial Establishments in the United States,"* 1919.

Ibid.: Bul. No. 222, 1917, *"Welfare Work in British Munition Factories."*

Ibid.: Monthly Review, vol. 5, (1917) No. 4, pp. 154-6; No. 5, pp. 201-212; No. 6, pp. 207-215; vol. 6, (1918) No. 1, pp. 195-205; No. 3, pp. 199–206.

CHAPTER VI

THE CHARITY ORGANIZATION MOVEMENT

We have seen how employers' welfare work arose out of the Industrial Revolution, and how in response to the democratic movement it is giving way to other activities. In place of "uplift" work performed by employers for their employes, we are finding three lines of effort that redound to the advantage of people who work for wages: (1) service departments which attend to health, for example, as a part of the business, without pretense of philanthropy, (2) public regulation of working conditions and administration of insurance funds, (3) organization of working people to solve their own problems.

Similarly we shall find the charity organization movement arising out of the Industrial Revolution and gradually giving way before the growing impetus of democracy. In this instance, however, we are dealing with a "second growth." The first response of philanthropists who were unwilling to leave the care of the needy to public relief or ecclesiastical charities was a host of small, uncorrelated societies. The resultant chaos with its alternating neglect and overindulgence set the stage for the charity organization movement. We have already seen how the twentieth century is displacing charity organization societies with family welfare associations on the one hand and community councils on the other.

THE HAMBURG-ELBERFELD SYSTEM

The sort of thing that we have come to recognize as the charity organization movement seems to have begun in Germany and in England at about the same time. More-

over, it appears that the German and English pioneers in this field were in contact with each other and exchanged numerous ideas. The German development is ordinarily traced to the reorganization of relief work in the city of Hamburg in 1788. The plan which was there put into effect was adopted with some modifications at Elberfeld, in 1852.

The plan of organization involved the division of the city into "quarters," each of which was supposed to contain not more than four dependent individuals or heads of families. Each quarter was placed under the supervision of a visitor, known as the *Armenpfleger,* whose duty it was to visit the poor of his quarter at regular intervals, keep himself informed as to their circumstances, and use his influence to improve their manner of living. The quarters were grouped into districts, at the head of each of which there was a superintendent, or *Vorsteher.* His duties were to direct the work of the various quarters in his district. He was to arrange meetings of his visitors for the purpose of discussing the work and deciding upon the amount, kind and duration of aid to be given. Over all the districts there was a central administrative board, or *Hauptverwaltung,* composed of a special municipal officer and certain members of the city council. The duties of this central board were to supervise the relief work of the entire city, make regulations, review decisions of the districts, and to supervise institutional relief. They were also supposed to devote some time to studying the causes of poverty.

With the exception of the chairman of the central board, all the offices were filled by citizens who served without pay. The voluntary visitors were given a voice in the decisions as to what should be done for their families; and the actions of the districts, while reviewed by the

general board, were not dependent on its approval for their validity.

The principal advantage of this system was that each dependent person or family had fairly intimate relations with the visitor in whose quarter he lived. But there was a corresponding disadvantage that a given case had to remain continuously under the same visitor, even though these relations might become strained, and though the visitor might be incompetent to handle the problems of the family in question.

Moreover, it presently came about that certain quarters, indeed, certain single houses contained a considerable number of needy families. Some visitors were responsible for tenement houses containing from fifty to sixty dependents. Because of this fact, when the so-called Hamburg-Elberfeld system was reorganized in the last decade of the nineteenth century, the "quarters" gave way to a district system.

Under this new scheme, the territorial units were larger, and any visitor assigned to the district might be given the duty of investigating or supervising any family within that part of the city. Every applicant for aid was required to present himself to the district superintendent, who referred him to one of the visitors. This made it possible to guard against overburdening particular workers and also to change visitors in case some good reason should arise.

The idea of individualization was pretty clearly developed by the administrators of this scheme of relief. Individualization to them had reference both to investigation and to treatment. But apparently, it was the investigational side of the work that was most emphasised. Certainly, it was this that particularly impressed some of the English students and Poor Law officials who looked into

the German system. This is made clear by the following paragraph from a pamphlet written by one of the English Poor Law inspectors fifty years ago: "In the first place, the applicant for relief is subjected to an examination so close and searching, so absolutely inquisitorial, that no man who could possibly escape from it would submit to it. He is not one of several hundreds who can tell his own story to an overworked relieving officer, but one of a very few, never exceeding four—frequently the single applicant—who is bound by law to answer every one of that long string of questions that his interrogator is bound by law to put to him. One of the peculiar merits claimed, and I believe rightly claimed, for this system is that before a man can obtain relief it must be shown that he cannot exist without it."

This indicates what was probably true both in Germany and in England, that very little attention was given to any except the economic aspects of a family's life, and that investigation looked to the repression of unnecessary demands for assistance rather than to the building up of the physical and moral resources of the family.

THE LONDON CHARITY ORGANIZATION SOCIETY

The first charity organization society to bear that name was founded in London in 1869. Back of it there lay just the sort of circumstances that we have already described. The Poor Law administered rigidly in some communities and laxly in others failed to meet the needs of a very large number of people. In spite of the "workhouse test" (which we shall study more fully in a later chapter) and possibly because of it, there were thousands of beggars in the English cities. Their existence meant, of course, that there was a vast amount of indiscriminate almsgiving by charitable individuals and by philanthropic societies. These various organizations and individuals worked quite

independently of one another, with the result that there was an enormous amount of overlapping on the one hand, and neglect on the other. Astute beggars were receiving assistance from several different sources, while more modest and perhaps more needy people were overlooked by all the charities. We are told of various free refuges, of suppers, relief associations, coal and bread clubs, soup kitchens, visiting and Bible societies, and many others.

One of those who appreciated this situation was the Rev. Henry Solly, a Unitarian minister, who in 1868 read before the Society of Arts a paper entitled, " How to deal with the unemployed poor in London and with its roughs and criminal classes." The reading of this paper seems to have produced quite a stir, and resulted almost immediately in the formation of a committee which called itself, at first, the " Society for the Prevention of Pauperism and Crime." It issued a series of prospectuses, which outlined a number of plans for dealing with the problems of poverty in London. Somewhat later in the same year, a Doctor Hawksley proposed a scheme for organizing all the charities and administering them through district offices. These were to be in constant touch with each other and under the general direction of a central office. This overhead administration was to be financed by a tax of one per cent. of their annual incomes, to be paid by all the charities into a common fund. Following this suggestion, a conference was called to which all the charities of London were invited to send representatives. It seems that a good many of them responded, but did not consent readily to the plan of centralization. However, a start was made in 1869 under the title of the " Society for Organizing Charitable Relief and Repressing Mendicity." This was changed in 1870 to the "Charity Organization Society."

At the outset the secretaries of the society gave their

services without compensation, as did the members of the district committees. But after a time, the volume of work was found to be so great that the full time of paid secretaries was essential. One of the early general secretaries was Charles S. Loch, who served the society for some forty years. However, the work in the districts continued to be done for some time by volunteers. A few of the district committees had experienced members, such as Miss Octavia Hill, but the most of them apparently did not.

The original idea of the society does not seem to have involved the giving of relief, but rather the correlation of existing charities. It was thought that the central organization might subsidize some of the constituent societies, but it was not long before the direct giving of relief was made a part of the work of the charity organization society. In addition to bringing the many independent organizations together, the charity organization society was looked to as an example which should educate the other organizations, showing them how to do their work most effectively. Also, it undertook to bring about a central registration of all persons receiving assistance from any of the charities. The purpose was not merely the elimination of fraud, but the making possible of a coherent plan of treatment by guarding against overlapping and working at cross purposes.

As in the case of the German reformers, the early members of the London Charity Organization Society sought to bring about thorough investigation of all applicants for aid and systematic visitation of poor families. The Germans undertook to accomplish this by compelling citizens to give their services without pay to the administration of municipal relief. In England it was a private agency, the London Charity Organization Society, which made earnest appeals for volunteer visitors who should not

merely learn the facts that needed to be known about applicants for relief, but also follow them up with supervision and advice, which it was hoped might serve to put the families on their own feet.

SPREAD OF THE MOVEMENT IN AMERICA

The general situation which gave rise to the Hamburg-Elberfeld system in Germany and the first Charity Organization Society in England was responsible for a similar movement in the United States. About the middle of the last century, there were organized in most of our large cities relief societies which bore some such title as "Society for the Improvement of the Condition of the Poor." It was their express purpose to find work for all who were willing to accept it, to investigate all cases thoroughly, and to bring the needy to a point where they would no longer require assistance. But being dispensers of material aid, they soon, as one writer puts it, "sank into the sea of almsgiving." As early as the year 1840, there were over thirty relief societies in the city of New York.

An informally constituted committee in 1843 made a report somewhat to the following effect: (1) that the want of discrimination in giving relief was a fundamental and very prevalent defect in most of these schemes of charity; (2) that the societies were acting independently of each other, with the result that artful mendicants were receiving assistance from many of the societies at the same time, while the better class of the needy were frequently going unaided; (3) that there was not adequate provision for personal relations between those who gave and those who received the alms, as a consequence of which, the societies failed to provide for the permanent physical and moral improvement of those whom they relieved; (4) that it was apparent that no form of charity which did not have special

reference to the removal of the causes of pauperism could fail to increase its amount.

Thus there was a situation in America which was almost identical with that which in England called the charity organization movement into being. But there were two other factors which affected its beginnings in this country. One was the industrial depression which followed the commercial crisis of 1873 and which threw multitudes out of work. The other was the coming to America of some English clergymen who had been active in the London Charity Organization Society. The formation of the early societies in the United States is so well described in the report of a committee of the National Conference of Charities and Correction in 1893 that we shall borrow rather liberally from it.

"In 1874 Rev. Charles G. Ames led in the formation, upon London models, in Germantown, a suburban ward of Philadelphia, of an association which employed household visitors to investigate applicants for aid, availed itself of the soup-house, fuel societies, churches, and especially of the outdoor municipal relief in procuring the requisite assistance, and supplemented it as need indicated from its own resources."

In the autumn of 1875 the Coöperative Society of Visitors Among the Poor was formed in Boston, its plan being a modification of the Elberfeld system. But Buffalo "has the honor of being the first city in the United States to produce a complete Charity Organization Society of the London type." The immediate and most active promoter was the Rev. S. H. Gurteen, an English clergyman. He organized the work of his parish guild so that the case of every applicant for aid was promptly investigated. He lectured on "Phases of Charity," and proposed a central clearing-house for the charities of the city. As a result of

these and similar activities the Buffalo Charity Organization Society was organized in 1877, and it "adhered to the principle of coördinating existing relief agencies and giving no relief from its own funds except in rare emergencies."

The Philadelphia society seems to have started with "the officers of several soup societies." The plan of organization was that of "ward associations" correlated through a central board. In commenting on this the committee of 1893 says that "the work often fell into wrong hands, and the Ward Associations were so many new almsgiving societies. By their attitude they were virtually saying to all the older charitable societies that there was no need of them, and they, as a rule, refused coöperation, and still withhold it." There are enough evidences of this "holier than thou" attitude in other cities to justify us in saying that it has been a rather frequent failing of the charity organization societies.

By 1893 there were reported to be fifty-five such organizations in the United States, and the present number is probably not far from four hundred. In order to stimulate this development, the Russell Sage Foundation established a charity organization department in charge of Miss Mary Richmond. More recently there has been organized a more or less independent society known at first as the American Association of Societies for Organizing Charity and now called the American Association for Organizing Family Social Work. These two agencies have through community studies, the distribution of literature and other publicity greatly increased the number of societies and have also developed an *èsprit de corps* among the secretaries and other workers.

POLICIES OF THE CHARITY ORGANIZATION MOVEMENT

We have already noted how the early charity organization folk set themselves against the giving of material relief. Very soon, however, they found themselves compelled to distribute groceries, cash, etc., but wherever possible they get some other agency or some individual to do this. The Charity Organization Society therefore mediates between its "client" and the sources of relief. The virtue of this has lain in calling attention to the more important aspects of social work, the diagnosis and adjustment of personal difficulties. But its vice has been the development of an attitude verging on stinginess where material aid is really necessary, and the inefficient expenditure of effort in assembling a few dollars here, a basket of groceries there, a bag of coal yonder and a pair of blankets somewhere else.

Another policy of the C. O. S. has been the correlation of other agencies. In this it has never been entirely successful, perhaps for reasons suggested in the report on the Philadelphia society. The idea of one private organization saying to the others, "Here, do your work through us, and make us the center of social work in this city" has never appealed strongly to those in other societies. What is happening today is the development of correlation, to which the C. O. S. had pointed the way, through more or less democratically organized "councils of social agencies" in which the C. O. S. takes its place as one of the group, instead of as a somewhat dictatorial outsider.

The development of clearing houses or central registration bureaus has been a third policy of the C. O. S. This has been really a phase of the policy of correlation and seems to be going through a similar transition. That is, the idea of registration is good and will be retained and extended, but it will doubtless be more and

more administered by coöperative effort instead of by one single agency.

Friendly visiting has been a fourth policy, and it still occupies a large part of the C. O. S. program. The 1893 report speaks of friendly visiting as "the soul of the movement." The plan is that of "inducing men and women having strength of character to go to the homes of the needy, each taking the chief responsibility for the proper development, material and moral, of a few families." While it has been often "the means by which the higher resources of society, its hope, discipline, thrift and kindness of heart, are diffused among the depressed and those who have fallen by the way," it has also often been the occasion for "emotional sprees" indulged in by "Ladies Bountiful." Probably most friendly visiting has not really been friendly, in the sense of involving a mutual relationship; it has more likely been "uplift," which is something very different from friendship.

District conferences represent a fifth policy of the C. O. S. These include not only social workers, but people of various other occupations as well. Their purposes are four: (1) to "thresh out" difficult problems, (2) to train volunteers and new workers, (3) to retain the interest of good contributors, (4) to use individual problems as a basis for planning community programs.

"Provident schemes" which interested the early C. O. S. included: day nurseries, kindergartens, classes in cooking, manual training, stamp books and fuel funds. Much attention was also given to the repression of street begging and vagrancy. The C. O. S. workers interested themselves in better housing and in various sorts of remedial legislation, such as the "separation of paupers from criminals in public institutions," amendment of poor relief laws, estab-

lishment of municipal lodging-houses and the regulation of immigration.

A more recent development is the Transportation Agreement, first drawn up under the auspices of the National Conference of Charities and Correction, and now having nearly 800 signers. Its most important provisions are these: (1) No charitable transportation is to be granted without reliable evidence that the applicant is unable to pay his fare, that his condition and prospects will be improved by going to the new place, and that he will have resources for his maintenance at the destination or that he has a legal residence there. (2) The applicant is to be taken care of until the necessary evidence can be obtained. (3) The charitable organization or official at the destination is to be advised that transportation is being considered or has been determined upon.

Perhaps the greatest contribution of the charity organization movement has been the development of what has come to be known as the "case method" of analysing and treating human problems. By this is meant essentially the study and treatment of each individual and family as a unique problem. The effort is made to secure such significant information about family histories, physical and mental condition, habits, education, occupation, attitudes and relations to other people as will make possible a clear definition of the problem to be solved. On the side of treatment it means the utilization of the particular resources available to the individual or family in question in such manner that the difficulty may be removed.

WIDER APPLICATION OF THE CASE METHOD

It is obviously impossible in this brief discussion to present anything like an adequate account of the technique of case work. But some further understanding of it may

be gathered from noting the wide range of agencies in which it is being found serviceable. Among these are organizations which work with children, such as societies for the prevention of cruelty to children, children's home societies, juvenile courts, children's institutions, etc. All of the best of these agencies do careful case work and coöperate closely with other social agencies. Not only have the children's agencies adopted many case work principles; they have added to them, their particular contribution being the use of applied psychology. Especially noteworthy has been the work done in the juvenile courts of Chicago and Boston, and in the Ohio Bureau of Juvenile Research.

A similar development has taken place in the handling of adult delinquents. Here, however, it has been the psychiatrists rather than the psychologists who have been most active and have added most to the technique of case work. Some of the most significant work along this line has been done in the municipal courts of Chicago, Boston, Philadelphia, and in such institutions as Sing Sing, Westchester County Penitentiary, Indiana State Prison, and the reformatories for women at Bedford Hills, New York, and South Framingham, Massachusetts.

A third field for the application of C. O. S methods is medical social work. By this, we mean assistance to the physicians of a hospital or dispensary in the education of patients and in the control of their environment. The first social service department of this type was founded in 1906 at the Massachusetts General Hospital by Dr. Richard C. Cabot. Among the services most frequently rendered by such departments are arranging for convalescent care, aid in diagnosis by investigating past history, supervising hygiene, arranging for examination of persons exposed to contagious diseases, securing and supervising the wear-

ing of apparatus, and assuring advised hospital care. It has been pointed out by those engaged in this work that the presence of acute poverty is not the most frequent cause for taking up a social service case in a hospital or dispensary, and that education rather than relief is the dominating activity.

Vocational guidance and labor management provide unlimited opportunities for applying and still further developing the techniques originally developed by the charity organization societies. In both these newer lines of work, it is found necessary to make a careful study of the individual's personal traits. Wise action can not be taken without adequate information concerning the person's physical and mental condition, his character, his physical environment and his associates.

Other uses for this technique are to be found in the public schools, in religious work, in courts of domestic relations, and in the diagnosis of feeblemindedness and insanity.

But perhaps the most important application of the case method has been in the field of social science. That is, it is coming to be used not merely with reference to particular cases which it is desired to help, but also as a means of working at scientific problems of a more general character. This appears, as might be anticipated, in books dealing with delinquents such as those of Healy and Kammerer, and in such magazines as the Journal of Criminal Law and the Journal of Delinquency. It also appears in studies like Miss Brandt's "574 Deserters and Their Families," and Mrs. Solenberger's "One Thousand Homeless Men." The case method has been definitely employed in the training of social workers, and teaching records have been prepared by the Russell Sage Foundation and the American Red Cross. Even more significant is the adoption of the case

method by the students of Social Psychology and Race Problems. This, for example, underlies such works as Thomas' "Polish Peasant."

Indeed, the social scientists owe a peculiar debt of gratitude to the charity organization movement for giving them the case method. Had the C. O. S. movement failed utterly as a scheme of relief—which, of course, it has not—it would still have made an invaluable contribution in this method of studying social problems. To have developed out of indiscriminate almsgiving and perfunctory investigation a genuine technology is no mean achievement.

In this development of the charity organization movement, it is interesting to see how out of a bourgeois philanthropy there has been gradually growing up the idea of professional service, utilizing scientific principles and methods. The recent eagerness to displace the name "charity organization society" with that of "family welfare association" suggests the spirit of this change. Also, there has been a growing emphasis upon preventive and constructive work. Social legislation and educational efforts to raise the standards of living have more and more interested those whose primary activities have been in the charity organization societies or their successors. In England these folk were particularly strong advocates of old age pensions, and in America of the health insurance schemes, which so far have failed of adoption.

SUGGESTED READINGS

Bosanquet, Helen: *Social Work in London, 1869 to 1912. A History of the Charity Organization Society.* London: John Murray, 1914.

Loch, C. S.: *Charity Organization.* London: Swan Sonnenschein, 1892.

London Charity Organization Society. Occasional Papers.

Gurteen, S. H.: *A Handbook of Charity Organization.* Buffalo, 1882.

Nat. Conf. Char. & Corr., 1881, 100–195; 1893, 52–93.

Brandt, Lilian: *The Charity Organization Society of the City of New York, 1882–1907.* New York: United Charities Bldg., 1907.

Warner, Amos G.: *American Charities.* New York: Crowell, third edition, 1919. Chap. 22 (second edition, Chap 19).

Devine, Edward T.: *The Principles of Relief.* New York: Macmillan, 1905, Part 3, Chap. 3.

Richmond, Mary E.: *Social Diagnosis.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1917.

Richmond, Mary E.: *What Is Social Case Work?* New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1922.

Periodicals: *Charity Organization Review* (London), *Charities and Commons* (New York and Chicago), *Survey* (New York), *Family* (New York).

CHAPTER VII

HOUSING REFORM

CLOSELY related to the charity organization movement is the effort to better housing conditions. The modern problems of housing grew up with those of poverty and anonymity during and after the Industrial Revolution. The rapid building of factories and the extension of commerce drew into the towns and cities crowds of people whom they were not at all ready to accommodate. This meant inevitably overcrowding and soaring rents. The crowding and poverty of the new city-dwellers combined with their ignorance of sanitation to destroy health and breed disease.

How bad conditions really were may be gathered from Lord Shaftesbury's description of a part of London in the sixties. "There was a famous place called Bermondsey Island. . . . . It was a large swamp; a number of people lived there, as they do in Holland, in houses built upon piles . . . . . So bad was the supply of water there that I have positively seen the women drop their buckets into the water over which they were living, and in which was deposited all the filth of the place, that being the only water that they had for every purpose—washing, drinking and so on."

In 1853 the Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor in New York presented to the public a startling picture of dilapidation and filth. In the course of the report it described a notorious tenement known as "Gotham Court," which housed over 500 people. Although described as "one of the better class," its apartments or tenements

consisted of two rooms each which housed at the time of the investigation an average of seven persons. In place of a private toilet for each family, there were a number of privies in the basement of this five-story building. These were so insanitary as to produce a distinct odor as high as the third floor. Of the 504 tenants, 146 were found to be suffering from serious diseases, including small-pox, typhus, scarletina and measles. The annual death rate in the building was nearly twenty per cent.

Some attention was, as we have already seen, given to the problems of housing their employes by the early factory owners. But the special interest in housing seems to have developed most rapidly in cities where there were charity organization societies. Moreover, the very same people were frequently interested in both projects.

THE BOURGEOIS REFORMERS

The essentially bourgeois character of the movement for housing reform appears in the following names and titles: Society for Improving the Condition of the Laboring Classes, Bill for Facilitating the Improvement of the Dwellings of the Working Classes in Large Towns, Commission on the Housing of the Working Classes, etc. As late as 1894 a Federal report bore this title: The Slums of Baltimore, Chicago, New York and Philadelphia. In this report "slums" were defined as "dirty, back streets, especially such streets as are inhabited by a squalid and criminal population." And then, comments Mrs. Wood, "they are surprised by the lack of cordiality with which their investigators are received by those whom they have just labeled 'a squalid and criminal population!'"

The housing reform movement in London seems to have started with the Society for Improving the Condition of the Laboring Classes in 1844. Within a dozen years

there were eight associations of a similar character. From the very beginning the Charity Organization Society interested itself in housing. One of those whose names are prominently associated with both movements was Miss Octavia Hill. In 1865 she raised enough money to buy three dilapidated houses and begin her experiment of rent collecting through friendly visitors. She undertook to prove " that the most unpromising old tenements could be put in a fairly sanitary condition by judicious repairs, and that through devoted personal service and the establishment of friendly relations with the tenants, the houses could be kept clean and decent and a great improvement effected in the health and habits of the people living in them." In 1822 the London Charity Organization Society formed a number of Sanitary Aid Committees, which were to invite complaints of insanitary conditions, investigate these, and in their discretion bring them to the attention of the local sanitary authorities, the owner, water company or the police.

In 1884 a Unitarian clergyman who was one of the original promoters of the Charity Organization Society, started a campaign for the building of industrial villages. As a result a number of companies were organized to build houses just outside of London. Among these were the Cottage Homes Company, the People's Homes, Ltd., and the East End Dwellings Company. About 1890 Ebenezer Howard published his book, " Garden Cities of Tomorrow," and in 1899 the Garden City Association was formed to carry out his ideas. In 1903 First Garden City, Ltd., was organized and Letchworth was built.

A similar series of events may be traced in New York. In 1846 the Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor began a vigorous agitation for better housing. In 1853 it appointed a special committee " to inquire into the

sanitary condition of the laboring classes and the practicability of devising measures for improving the comfort and healthiness of their habitations." This committee made an elaborate statistical investigation which has been described as "the first sociological study of tenement conditions."

The story of the first legislative committee appointed in 1857 to examine into the condition of "tenant houses" in New York and Brooklyn is thus told by Mrs. Wood. They decided "'to proceed to a thorough personal inspection of tenant houses in every ward of the city.' Safeguarded by a detail of police, guided by the chief of the sanitary bureau, and accompanied by reporters, they 'penetrated to localities and witnessed scenes which in frightful novelty far exceeded the limit of their previously conceived ideas of human degredation and suffering,' The committee felt that they were indeed exploring a strange and hostile land in performing what they described as their 'arduous, painful, and as may be conjectured hazardous duty.'"

Following the "draft riots" of 1863 a number of prominent people organized the Citizen's Association, which created a sub-committee known as the Council of Hygiene and Public Health. The Council at once planned a thorough sanitary investigation of the city, and presented a valuable report including maps and diagrams. In the seventies the State Charities Aid Association assumed a prominent place in the housing movement. In the eighties Jacob Riis contributed his newspaper technique to the cause. During these years numbers of "model tenements" were erected; of these we shall speak later.

In 1898 the New York Charity Organization Society assumed an active part in the agitation. It appointed a tenement house committee which spent six months framing

a series of proposed ordinances which were given wide publicity through a pamphlet of the society and through newspaper comments. However, none of the recommendations were adopted by the municipal authorities. The Society then planned and carried through a tenement house exposition, with models, photographs, maps, charts and statistics. In connection with this, the committee held a competition to arouse interest among architects. The outcome of this series of efforts was the establishment of a Tenement House Commission for the City of New York.

MODEL HOUSING UNDER PRIVATE INITIATIVE

Along with all this agitation and in part resulting from it have come four types of results: (1) "model housing" under private initiative, (2) restrictive legislation pertaining to light, air, fire protection, etc., (3) construction of new houses by the government or with government aid, (4) city planning and zoning.

The privately initiated schemes may be classed under five heads: (a) philanthropic trust funds, (b) limited dividend housing companies, (c) Octavia Hill enterprises, (d) industrial housing by employers, (e) chamber of commerce enterprises. Of the philanthropic trust funds there are numerous examples in England and Germany, but only two of importance in the United States. One is the Charlesbank Homes of Boston, founded in 1911 by Edwin Ginn, the publisher. The physical equipment consists in a five-story building with 103 apartments. The descriptive booklet states that "no profits or income derived in any way from the building will at any time be divided among the incorporators . . . . . but all such profits and net income will be applied to the purchase of land and the erection of other buildings to extend the blessings and benefits of good homes to needy and deserving people."

The limited dividend housing companies represent what is sometimes referred to as "philanthropy at five per cent." They have produced "model tenements," two-flat houses and a few single family dwellings. Among the companies which have erected "model tenements" are the Workman's Home Association (New York, 1854), Coöperative Building Company (Boston, 1871), Alfred T. White Tenements (New York, 1878–1890), City and Suburban Homes Company (New York, 1896). The Boston Coöperative Building Company limited its dividends to seven per cent., and of late years has been earning only four or five per cent. It has built five groups of tenement houses, with every room opening to the outer air, running water in every apartment, but not fireproof and without separate toilet facilities. A committee of ladies was in charge of each estate, and in the main women agents have been employed.

The Washington Sanitary Improvement Company has built 310 two-flat houses with separate entrances and separate back yards for the two families sharing each house. Each flat has toilet, bath, gas and other improvements. Dividends of five per cent. are paid to the stockholders. Single family houses built by limited dividend companies are much more numerous in England than in America. In this country a few houses have been so provided at Billerica, Mass.; Westerly Gardens, N. J.; Titus Town, Va., and Torrance, Cal.

The Octavia Hill idea to which we referred above has been applied in a number of different cities, but apparently the only organization to bear her name is the Octavia Hill Association of Philadelphia. This was organized in 1896 as a joint stock company for "holding, selling and leasing real estate." The articles of incorporation state that its aim is "to improve the living conditions of the poorer

residence districts of the City of Philadelphia . . . . It offers its services also to other owners of like properties. In this capacity it attends to collection, alteration, repairs, clerical and special work, general oversight, etc., and makes a fair charge for such services." While the articles of incorporation do not limit the dividends, the directors have restricted them to four per cent. The 1917 report of the Association stated that it owned 179 houses with 244 families and was agent for 224 houses and 460 families.

The efforts of employers to provide housing for their workmen have been described in the chapter on Industrial Welfare Work. Closely related to them are the more recent chamber of commerce enterprises. Under the auspices of chambers of commerce building companies have been formed since 1910 in Albany, N. Y.; Elmira, N. Y.; Kenosha, Wis.; Bridgeport, Conn. and Flint, Mich.

HOUSING LEGISLATION

Legislation in the United States has dealt almost exclusively with the negative or restrictive aspect of housing problems. It has been largely of the "thou-shalt-not" variety, and has rarely provided for the construction of houses to meet the shortage or to displace those which needed to be torn down. The earliest legislation of this sort in America resulted from the work of the Council of Hygiene and Public Health in New York. The first steps were the establishment of the Metropolitan Board of Health in 1866, and in 1867 the enactment of a tenement house law. This and all subsequent legislation in New York has stressed the negative, and out of it has come a "model housing law" worked out largely by Mr. Veiller. The New York development has influenced the rest of the country, and the National Housing Association has a list of over

forty cities—far too few—which are supposed to have housing or tenement house codes.

The pioneers in constructive housing legislation are Great Britain, Belgium and Germany. Following them, France, Italy, Australia, New Zealand and numerous other countries have offered government aid in the construction of new houses. The four leading types of government aid to be found in foreign countries are: (1) state or municipal construction, (2) loans to non-commercial housing companies, (3) loans to individuals, (4) exemption from taxation.

Under the first plan, the state or the city buys land, builds houses and then rents them, turns them over to the housing companies to manage, or sells them on easy terms to the tenants. This direct governmental participation is most developed in Germany, although it has also become very important in England. The only important instance of the kind in the United States has been the work of the Federal Government in providing houses for "war workers." However, a small start has been made by the Massachusetts Homestead Commission.

The second plan is for the state to lend money at a low rate of interest to non-commercial housing companies, whether philanthropic in character or coöperative societies. This seems to be the characteristic method in Italy, but has received its widest development in England and Germany.

The third scheme is to loan money on favorable terms to the individual who wishes to buy or build his own home. In Belgium and France the loans are negotiated through non-commercial loan companies, in New Zealand they are made directly. This plan has produced fewer results than either of the others, and has particularly failed to reach the unskilled wage-earners.

As compared with the preceding types of government aid, the exemption from taxation is relatively unimportant and need not detain us here.

CITY PLANNING AND ZONING

Closely connected with the housing movement and in part an outgrowth of it is the more recent development of city planning and zoning. Washington and Philadelphia were planned from the beginning. The city council of New York in 1807 appointed a commission to prepare a plan for the city. In 1843 Robert Gourley made "Plans for Enlarging and Improving the City of Boston." But the modern city planning movement dates from the nineties. Influenced by the French and English, American architects interested themselves in the "city beautiful." The series of fairs and expositions beginning with the World's Fair at Chicago in 1893 also seems to have furnished an example and incentive to the real planning of cities. Immediately after the World's Fair, Chicago began to elevate its railway tracks and to expand its park system. Presently the Commercial Club took up the idea and put forth a very elaborate plan intended to cost the city some $200,000,000.

As in Chicago a great deal has been accomplished by privately organized city planning commissions. But more and more this function is being taken over by city governments. The first Municipal Plan Commission seems to have been appointed in Hartford, Conn., in 1907, but so rapidly has the idea spread that by 1914 nearly one hundred cities had such commissions. There are now five states which have laws permitting cities to appoint official planning boards—New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio and California—besides Massachusetts, which requires them to do so.

Zoning developed first in Germany. This involved the districting of a city for residential, commercial and industrial purposes. It usually included the regulation of heights of buildings and the percentage of a lot which might be built upon. Boston and Baltimore were the first American cities to regulate the height of buildings, and Los Angeles was the first to create residence districts in which certain occupations could not be carried on.

In the movement for housing reform we see much the same trend that we recognized in the charity organization movement. Both started as the philanthropic enterprises of private individuals, most of whom belong to the middle and upper classes. Both are coming to be more and more recognized as public functions carried on by the community as a whole. In neither case are we ready to dispense with charity, for democracy has not yet been achieved. But all signs point to a transition from benevolent uplift work to professional public service.

SUGGESTED READINGS

DeForest, Robt. W., and Veiller, Lawrence: *The Tenement House Problem.* New York: Macmillan, 1903.

Wood, Edith E.: *The Housing of the Unskilled Wage Earner.* New York: Macmillan, 1919.

U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Bulletin No. 158, 1915. "Government Aid to Home-owning and Housing of Working People in Foreign Countries."

London County Council. *The Housing Question in London—1855–1900.* London: P. S. King, 1901.

Bosanquet, Helen D.: *Social Work in London.* New York: Dutton, 1914.

Bowmaker, Edw.: *The Housing of the Working Classes.* London: Methuen, 1895.

Parsons, Jas.: *Housing by Voluntary Enterprise.* London: King, 1903.

Clarke, J. J.: *The Housing Problem, Its History, Growth, Legislation and Procedure.* London: Pitman.

Reports of State Departments, *e.g.*, California Commission of Immigration and Housing, Massachusetts Homestead Commission, Michigan Housing Commission, New Jersey Board of Tenement House Supervision.

Reports of Municipal Departments, *e.g.*, New York Tenement House Department, Louisville Tenement House Commission, Los Angeles Housing Commission, Kansas City Board of Public Welfare (special report 1912).

Reports of Housing Associations: Cambridge Housing Association, San Francisco Housing Association, Philadelphia Housing Commission.

Housing Problems in America. Proceedings of the National Housing Conference, 1912—

CHAPTER VIII

THE SETTLEMENT MOVEMENT

"A SETTLEMENT is a colony of members of the upper classes, formed in a poor neighborhood, with the double purpose of getting to know the local conditions of life from personal observation, and of helping where help is needed. The settler gives up the comfort of a West End home, and becomes a friend of the poor. He sacrifices to them his hours of leisure, and fills his imagination with pictures of misery and crime, instead of with impressions of beauty and happiness. For a shorter or longer time the slum becomes his home. Only seldom does he show himself at his Club, at the theatre, in Society. This means the loosening of social and personal ties, in many cases the foregoing of the prospect of an early marriage, and neglect of favorite pursuits. It means a sacrifice of life . . . . . The settler comes to the poor as man to man, in the conviction that it means a misfortune for all parties and a danger for the nation, if the different classes live in complete isolation of thought and environment. He comes to bridge the gulf between the classes. He has lost confidence in legislative and administrative measures which would solve the social problem academically, and he hates the established forms of a charity which humbles instead of elevating, and demoralizes instead of improving. He mistrusts dead organizations, and would replace them by personal relationships. Not as an official but as a friend does he approach the poor, and he knows that he is thereby not only the giver but the receiver. Life instead of machinery, exact knowledge of the conditions to be improved, in the midst of which he must place himself instead of trusting to an unreliable judgment from a bird's-eye view —this is his motto."

In these words are the original spirit and methods of the social settlements summarized by one of their historians. These few sentences indicate at the same time the essentially bourgeois character of the settlements and their possibilities as the agents of democracy. They are shown to spring from sentimental motives, but at the same time, they are the expression of some of the finest idealism the world has ever seen.

The situation which called the settlements into being was substantially that which underlay the other humanitarian movements. In a sense this was merely one more effort to overcome the poverty, ignorance and exploitation of the commercial and industrial centers. But more specifically it was an attempt to bridge the gulf that separated social classes. In previous centuries caste lines had been even more sharply drawn, but because everyone's horizon was limited geographically he had an acquaintance with nearly everyone within its limits. The relations between nobles and peasants were much like those between white and black in the South—" separate as the fingers and one as the hand." But with the development of large-scale industry personal relations were rapidly lost. In the new cities rich and poor occupied different sections. The middle and upper classes had little to do with the wage-earners. In America this situation was intensified by the establishment of immigrant colonies in the midst of our cities. Although economically absorbed, they tended to remain culturally apart. One function of the settlement has been to bring these varied elements into closer touch with each other.

ENGLISH ORIGINS

The social settlements assume, therefore, the existence of a city " slum " on the one hand and a missionary spirit

on the other. The initiative for this new movement came quite directly from the intellectual idealists, men like Ruskin and Carlyle, and from the Christian socialists led by Maurice and Kingsley. But while the misery of English cities provided the occasion and the teachings of such men as Ruskin and Kingsley the inspiration, it was the students of Oxford and Cambridge who provided the working force and really set the settlements going. Maurice had tried to arouse interest among the University students in the Workingmen's College which was founded in London in 1854. As a result of his efforts many a man went on his own account to spend his vacation in a poor quarter of London to study conditions at first hand, and to help where he could.

One of the first of these was Edward Denison, who went to London in 1867 and founded a school in which he himself gave religious instruction and lectures. Another and even more famous member of this student group was Arnold Toynbee, who put himself in touch with the Reverend Mr. Barnett's parish in Whitechapel during the vacation of 1875. He visited the schools, made investigations for the Charity Organization Society, and joined a Workingmen's Club as means of acquainting himself more intimately with the misery which had been described to him at the University.

As we have already intimated, there was a strong religious element back of the settlement movement. There were numbers of missions maintained in the poorer part of London by the Anglican Church, in which some of the University men took an active part. The most famous of all the religious workers who had a share in starting the settlement movement was the Reverend Mr. Barnett, later Canon of Westminster, whose name has already been mentioned. He himself was an Oxford graduate, but

seems to have acquired his interest in social questions not so much through his University experience as through personal acquaintance with two social workers, one of whom later became his wife. In 1883, Mr. Barnett received a letter saying that two men at St. John's College, Cambridge, were ready to do something for the poor, but did not wish to start an ordinary mission. They wanted to put themselves into the work rather than simply making an annual subscription to the work of some clergyman in a poor parish.

Mr. Barnett replied with the suggestion that they should rent a house somewhere in the poorer part of the city and go there to live. In a sense, it may be said that this letter brought about the founding of the first settlement, Toynbee Hall. The same ideas were elaborated and further explained in a lecture that Mr. Barnett gave at Oxford later in the same year. He seems to have made a marked impression upon the students, for immediately after the lecture a committee of graduates and undergraduates was appointed to study and report on means for founding a University Colony in East London. The findings of this committee were laid before a gathering of interested people at Oxford early in 1884, as a result of which a society was formed for the purpose of founding a University Settlement in East London, to be managed by the Reverend Mr. Barnett. Because of the great interest which had been shown by Arnold Toynbee, and because of his premature death shortly before, it was decided to name the new institution in his memory Toynbee Hall.

In the course of the eighties, ten more settlements were established in Great Britain; and twenty-two were opened during the nineties. Since that time the numbers have not increased rapidly.

EARLY AMERICAN SETTLEMENTS

In the United States, the settlement seems to have had its beginning in the founding of the Neighborhood Guild in 1887 by Doctor Stanton Coit. Stimulated by a short residence at Toynbee Hall, Doctor Coit went to live in a tenement on the lower East Side of New York. After four years' existence as the Neighborhood Guild, this enterprise was reorganized in 1891 as the University Settlement Society. The constitution outlines as the aims of the Society "to bring men and women of education into closer relations with the laboring classes in this city for their mutual benefit. The Society shall establish and maintain in the tenement house districts places of residence for college men, and others desirous of aiding in the work, with rooms in the neighborhood where people may meet for social and educational purposes."

The second American settlement was Hull House, which was established in Chicago in 1889 by Jane Addams and Ellen Gates Starr. The founding of Hull House rested upon the belief "that the mere foothold of a house easily accessible, ample in space, hospitable, and tolerant in spirit, situated in the middle of large foreign colonies, which so easily isolated themselves in American cities, would be in itself a serviceable thing for Chicago." The Hull House charter states as its object "to provide a center for the higher civic and social life, to institute and maintain educational and philanthropic enterprises, and to investigate and improve the conditions in the industrial district of Chicago."

The third American settlement, known as the College Settlement and located in New York, was due to the efforts of women rather than men. Its beginnings reach back to the interest of some Smith College alumnæ in the new

philanthropic work in England, and especially in Toynbee Hall. A house was taken on Rivington Street, New York, in 1889, with Jean G. Fine as head worker. In the spring of 1890, the College Settlements Association was organized, with chapters in Wellesley, Smith, Vassar and Bryn Mawr. This Association made, for a time, annual appropriations to the College Settlement of New York, the College Settlement of Philadelphia, Denison House of Boston, and Locust Point Settlement of Baltimore. Later, it established fellowships for women desiring to study social problems in the settlements. In 1917, the widening interests of the Association were indicated in a change of name. It then became the Intercollegiate Community Service Association. It now has chapters in twenty women's colleges, and sub-chapters in over forty girls' schools. In addition to the activities previously enumerated, the Association conducts semi-annual conferences at the various colleges, arranges observation trips and visits to social agencies for undergraduates, and advises students in developing community work in the summer in their home towns.

The fourth of the American settlements was established in Boston in 1891 by Professor William J. Tucker of Andover Theological Seminary. It was known as Andover House until 1895, at which time it was given the name South End House. Robert A. Woods, who has been from the beginning the head of the House, was another of those who received his inspiration from a brief residence in Toynbee Hall. A circular, issued in 1891, stated the purposes of South End House in these words: "The House is designed to stand for the single idea of resident study and work in the neighborhood where it may be located. . . . . The whole aim and motive is religious, but the method is educational rather than evangelistic. A second,

though hardly secondary object. . . . . will be to create a center, for those within reach, of social study, discussion and organization."

Somewhat different was the history of the Henry Street Settlement established in 1893 on the East Side of New York City. Miss Lillian D. Wald, moved by the conditions surrounding a sick woman upon whom she had called, proposed with Miss Mary M. Brewster "to move into the neighborhood to carry on voluntary nursing and to contribute our citizenship to what seemed to be an alien group in a so-called democratic country." For a time these two nurses lived at the College Settlement. Later they rented the top floor of a tenement house and finally took the house at 265 Henry Street. In addition to the usual settlement activities, the Henry Street Settlement maintains a District Nursing Service in Manhattan and the Bronx, with several First Aid rooms, a number of Convalescent and Fresh Air Homes in the country, a Milk Dispensary, and follow-up work from school, hospital, asylum and dispensary.

Our story would be incomplete without at least mention of the many institutional churches and other religious centers such as Chicago Commons, Morgan Memorial in Boston and Salvation Army citadels in many cities. Since most of these have definite denominational affiliation, it is natural that their work should be colored by the sectarian connection These centers represent at their best an effort to socialize religion. At their worst they are an effort to attach this form of social work to the church simply to strengthen it as an institution.

THE SCOPE OF WORK

We have already indicated in a scattered way many of the activities of the social settlements. Perhaps it will be well at this point to bring them together in a summary fashion, so that the scope of their work may be more evident.

Perhaps the most important function of the settlements has been educational. There have been classes in English and civics for foreigners, classes in child hygiene for mothers, in home economics for young girls, in manual training for boys, and in art and music for those with these special interests. Second only to educational work has been the recreational. Usually there is a gymnasium, and frequently outdoor playgrounds as well. Provision is made for clubs, both for adults and children. There are boy scout troops and girls' camp-fires. There are dances, entertainments, pageants and picnics.

A somewhat different service has been the housing and correlating of various social agencies operating in the neighborhood of a given settlement. Often the settlement house is the district office of a Charity Organization Society or a Visiting Nurses' Association. Frequently it furnishes a room for the holding of clinics, and acts as a branch of the city library. In other ways it usually undertakes to make itself a genuine center of neighborhood life. It is frequently the headquarters of Neighborhood Improvement Associations, and the place for the holding of political meetings. All this is based upon the theory that people, even in great cities, live for the most part in neighborhood groups, and that these neighborhoods need some definite center for their common activities.

Still another function has been the carrying on of investigations. Closely related to this has been the political

activity of the settlements, directed toward the securing of reform legislation in city councils and State legislatures. Along with these has gone the training of social workers, some to be voluntary helpers, others to take up their residence at the settlement and devote their entire time to it and its administration. But not only has the settlement been a training ground for future social workers, it has been an educational institution in a much broader sense. It has been a means of bringing knowledge about "how the other half lives" to the well-to-do. In turn, it has doubtless brought to the "submerged tenth" a more adequate appreciation of their fellow citizens of the middle class, so that even though it originated as a manifestation of bourgeois benevolence, it has made a definite contribution to the democratic movement.

OUTGROWTHS AND ALLIES OF THE SETTLEMENTS

There have been numerous outgrowths of the settlement movement, only a few of which can be mentioned here. First of all, as a definite part of the movement, came the organization of the National Federation of Settlements. Influenced at least in part by this, there followed the Playground and Recreation Association of America, War Camp Community Service, and Community Service Incorporated. Less definitely connected with the settlements, but undoubtedly influenced by them, has been the growth of University Extension, both in England and America. Indeed, many of the activities of the settlements have been taken over or displaced by this "carrying the University to the people" through short courses, lectures, correspondence instruction, boys' and girls' clubs, etc., etc. Somewhat akin to University Extension, but professedly

more democratic, are the Workers' Educational Association of Great Britain and the Labor Colleges established in Boston, New York, Baltimore, and other American cities.

Even more definitely growing out of the settlements has been the development of the public school as a social center. This appears to have had its beginning in Rochester, New York, in 1907. In that year, one school was especially equipped for the various activities of the social center. This was so successful that the following year sixteen schools were used as Neighborhood Club Houses, open not only evenings, but Sunday afternoons as well. These centers have carried on almost every activity that is to be found in the social settlements. They have evening classes, all sorts of recreational activities, art exhibits, lectures, entertainments, gymnasiums, playgrounds. In Rochester, they have the coöperation of the Dental Association, Health Department and Art Club.

The most rapid development of social centers in the public schools seems to have taken place in Wisconsin and California, where provision has been made for this purpose by state law. Clarence Arthur Perry reported in 1913 that the movement had spread definitely to one hundred and twenty-six cities, and that seventy-one of them reported nearly twenty-one thousand paid workers; over five hundred school-houses were used for polling places, nearly five hundred for political meetings, over three hundred for exhibits, and over six hundred for motion pictures.

A development very much like the wider use of the school plant is illustrated by the small parks and field houses established by the various Park Commissions in Chicago. But still more interesting has been the development of community buildings in rural districts. In many

agricultural communities, the school house has long been the center of whatever activities were carried on in common, but relatively little use was made of it, and no special provision was made for any but the routine pedagogical work. But within the last few years, a large number of rural schools have been equipped to serve the various purposes of a community center.

In addition to using the school as a social center, there has been a growing interest in separate community buildings in small towns and country districts. In 1919, the office of Farm Management, of the United States Department of Agriculture, made a study of two hundred and fifty-six such buildings scattered over forty states.

The latest outgrowth of the movement, which was long represented by the settlements alone, is the social unit experiment in Cincinnati. In 1916, there was founded the National Social Unit Organization, whose purpose was stated to be this: "To promote a type of democratic community organization through which the citizenship as a whole can participate directly in the control of community affairs, while at the same time making constant use of the highest technical skill available."

For the purpose of making a three-year experiment and demonstration, the organization selected the Mohawk-Brighton District in Cincinnati. The four features of the Social Unit Organization as it was finally developed in the Mohawk-Brighton District are enumerated as follows:

1. The Citizens Council of thirty-one members, chosen by local Block Councils, which are in turn elected by residents of the blocks, every one of either sex over eighteen years of age residing in the block having the right to vote for the Block Councils. It is estimated that each of the thirty-one blocks includes a population of approximately one hundred families or five hundred people.

2. The Occupational Council, composed at present of the elected representatives of seven skilled groups serving, although not necessarily resident, in the district. The Occupational Council is elected by group councils organized in the following skilled groups: physicians, nurses, recreational workers, teachers, social workers, ministers and trade unionists.

3. The General Council, which has full control over all neighborhood programs, made up of the members of the Citizens Council and the Occupational Council sitting together.

4. The Council of Executives, consisting of the three executives of the three councils above named.

This whole movement is so very new that it is difficult to tell precisely what it has accomplished. Nevertheless, in the report of the evaluating committee, Edward T. Devine expresses the following opinion: "I have no doubt, from my observations and from the interviews which I have had with workers, residents, outside friends and critics, that the Social Unit has added substantially to the physical and moral well-being of the residents of the district; that it has led to more efficient and discriminating relief, to more thorough and constructive diagnosis of the needs of families in trouble; that it has prompted neighborliness and sociability; that it has made the ordinary family residing in the district more hospitable to visitors who come with a helpful purpose, and more discriminating as to the probable effect of sanitary and social measures brought forward for their benefit. I cannot discover that these results have been secured at a disproportionate cost. . . . . There is no doubt that members of the staff have worked with enthusiasm and unflagging energy to promote a democratic working organization, and that they have

obtained a gratifying response. Whether the new habits are sufficiently ingrained and the new associations are sufficiently well grounded to be permanent can be ascertained only as external support is diminished or withdrawn."

There has been a good deal of bourgeois opposition to the Social Unit scheme on the ground of its socialistic tendencies and its similarity to the much berated Soviets. It is feared that there is here a potential substitute for existing political government, and for existing voluntary social agencies.

Whatever else may be true, the Social Unit has a fundamentally democratic character, which is well described in the same report to which reference has just been made. "The unique feature of the plan seems to be that its founders and supporters are not trying to 'put over' anything except what they announce. They are interested in health, education, religion, morals, good citizenship and other concrete aims, but only secondarily. They are primarily and persistently interested in developing a plan by which people may understand, as the result of their own experience, thinking, and exchange of views, what degree and kind of health, education, recreation, etc., are desirable; and through which they can put into operation means of securing these desirable ends for themselves. They recognize that in order to secure such results, skilled expert service is essential, and that when the people decide what they want, the experts must be called in to decide on the basis of their own knowledge and experience how to secure those results; that, on the other hand, the measures and instruments proposed by the experts must be so far intelligible to and acceptable by the citizens as to win their approval."

Throughout the course of the development of neigh-

borhood and community work, from the founding of Toynbee Hall in London to the Social Unit in Cincinnati, there have been manifest certain pretty definite tendencies. There has been a gradual decrease of benevolent uplift and a gradual increase of neighborhood organization for self-expression. There is less philanthropy to disadvantaged neighborhoods and more arousal of whole communities to their common tasks. Through it all we see the slow growth of professional service in the employ of democratically organized groups.

SUGGESTED READINGS

The Settlements

Addams, Jane: *Twenty Years at Hull House.* New York: Macmillan, 1914.

Henderson, Chas. R.: *Social Settlements.* New York: Lentilhon, 1899.

Knapp, John M.: *The Universities and the Social Problem.* London: Rivington Percival, 1895.

Picht, Werner: *Toynbee Hall and the English Settlement Movement.* London: G. Bell, 1914.

Reason, W.: *University and Social Settlements.* London: Methuen, 1898.

Wald, Lillian D.: *The House on Henry Street.* New York: Holt, 1915.

Woods, Robert A., and Kennedy, Albert J.: *Handbook of Settlements.* New York: Charities Publication Committee, 1911.

National Federation of Settlements. Proceedings, 1911—

Reports of various settlements, *e.g.,* South End House, Boston; Chicago Commons, Chicago; Greenwich House, New York; Hiram House, Cleveland; Neighborhood House, Louisville; Irene Kauffman Settlement, Pittsburgh.

Allies and Outgrowths of the Settlements

Amos, A., and Hough, W. W.: *The Cambridge Mission to South London.* Cambridge: Macmillan & Bowes, 1904.

Coit, Stanton: *Neighbourhood Guilds.* London: Swan Sonnenschein, 1891.

Manson, John: *The Salvation Army and the Public.* London: Rutledge, 1906.

Perry, Clarence Arthur: *Wider Use of the School Plant.* New York: Survey Associates, 1913.

Ward, Edward J.: *The Social Center.* New York: Appleton, 1913.

U. S. Bureau of Education. Bulletin No. 84, 1919. "The University Extension Movement."

U. S. Department of Agriculture. Bulletin No. 825, 1920. "Rural Community Buildings in the United States."

National Social Unit: 1919 Conference Proceedings (pamphlets); *Survey,* Nov. 15, 1919, Sept. 1, 1920; *National Municipal Review,* Sept., 1920.

Dinwiddie, Courtenay: *Community Responsibility. A Review of the Cincinnati Social Unit Experiment.* New York: School of Social Work, 1922.

CHAPTER IX

THE CHILD WELFARE MOVEMENT

In all the phases of nineteenth century humanitarianism emphasis was laid on the importance of dealing effectively with the children. Charity organization societies, settlements and most other agencies saw in the children the possibilities of "constructive philanthropy." And there was also a group of societies which were devoted primarily, if not exclusively, to the protection, care and training of children.

The need of social work for children lay in the same social disorganization that gave rise to the other nineteenth century movements. The casualties of industry deprived children earlier and more frequently of their parents. The mobility and anonymity of industrial society meant that orphans were frequently left among strangers. Low wages and simplification of processes drew children into the factories. The employment of mothers was followed by improper feeding and lack of moral supervision.

CARE OF SPECIALLY NEEDY CHILDREN

A few orphan asylums were established by the early Christian Church. The number grew after the commercial revolution of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries; it was further augmented after the reformation, and increased rapidly after the industrial revolution. Most of the early modern institutions were maintained by the Catholic Church, but the Protestants too had a considerable number, and in both cases one of the dominant motives was the desire to have children brought up in the particular faith of the founders. This religious motive

has continued to the present day, but it has been yielding in relative emphasis first to the middle-class humanitarianism, and more recently to an interest in the child for his own sake as a present and prospective member of the community.

The first children's institution in America was connected with the Ursuline convent in New Orleans. The immediate occasion for its opening was a massacre by the Natchez Indians in 1729, which left many orphans in Louisiana. In 1738 the celebrated preacher, George Whitefield, established the Bethesda Orphan House in Savannah. These appear to have been the only pre-revolutionary children's agencies in this country. But after 1800 the number of orphanages increased rapidly, reaching 75 by 1850 and 600 by 1890. In 1910 Dr. Hastings H. Hart estimated that there were 100,000 children in such institutions.

Naturally there has been great variation in the equipment and management of these orphanages and "children's homes." Especially during the first half or three-quarters of the century were they of the type described as "congregate." That is, a considerable number of children, from 50 to 2000, were brought together in a single institution, frequently under a single roof. They commonly slept in great dormitories or barracks and ate in immense dining rooms. Their lives were governed by rather rigid schedules; individuality was suppressed, and the whole atmosphere tended to be one of monotonous routine. Such institutions were rather properly named "asylums."

But in the last quarter of the century and since 1900 there has been a growing number of institutions on the "cottage plan." The children live in relatively small groups and experience something approximating normal family life. Attention is given to their individual needs

and capacities. Diets are more varied. Education and recreation occupy most of the children's time, while institution housekeeping is left largely to paid helpers. Privacy is made possible by single rooms or very small dormitories.

One of the most notorious of the older institutions is Girard College in Philadelphia. In 1831 Stephen Girard left $6,000,000 under conditions which have not only made the institution self-sufficient but have caused the endowment to increase to something like $30,000,000. This will specified that "as many poor, white, male orphans, between the ages of six and ten years, as the said income shall be adequate to maintain, shall be introduced into the college as soon as possible." Such orphans were required to be legally surrendered to the "college" before they could be admitted. They were to be kept until the age of fourteen or not later than eighteen and then indentured. By 1890 the number of boys in the institution had grown to about 1500.

At the opposite pole of institutional planning is the New York Orphanage at Hastings-on-Hudson. Here 200 children are divided into small groups, each living in a separate cottage. Around the different cottages will be found flower beds, chicken coops and pets. Nearby will be found vegetable gardens, beehives, rabbit hutches, stables, etc. The children are encouraged to carry on such enterprises according to their individuality. The institution lacks the painful orderliness indoors and out which is visible in many institutions, yet it is well organized and efficiently managed.

After 1850 an increasing number of people began to have serious doubts as to the wisdom of bringing large bodies of children together in orphan asylums or children's homes, and there gradually grew up systems of placing

needy children in private homes. The first organization in America to adopt "placing-out" as a definite policy was the New York Children's Aid Society, which was founded in 1853. Its first circular sets forth both the purposes and the methods of work:

"This society has taken its origin in the deeply settled feeling of our citizens that something must be done to meet the increasing crime and poverty among the destitute children of New York. Its objects are to help this class by opening Sunday meetings and industrial schools, and gradually, as means shall be furnished, by forming lodging houses and reading rooms for children and by employing paid agents, whose sole business shall be to care for them. . . . . We hope, too, especially, to be the means of draining the city of these children, by communicating with farmers, manufacturers, or families in the country, who may need such employment. When homeless boys are found by our agents, we mean to get them homes in the families of respectable persons, and to put them in the way of an honest living."

Again and again reports of the society speak of "emigration" as "the best remedy for juvenile pauperism." The first "emigrant party" consisted of forty-six boys and girls who were taken to a small town in Michigan and distributed by methods suggested in the following excerpts from the journal of the society.

"At the close of the sermon the people were informed of the object of the Children's Aid Society. It met with the cordial approbation of all present, and several promised to take children. . . . . Monday morning the boys held themselves in readiness to receive applications from the farmers. . . . . There was a rivalry among the boys to see which first could get a home in the country, and before Saturday they were all gone."

In 1883 there was organized in Illinois a Children's Home Society with the following simple plan: "A central office at Chicago, with a state superintendent; districts including 6 to 25 counties, with district superintendents; local advisory boards in important towns throughout the state to report needy children and to assist in finding homes and supervising children; a small receiving home for the brief temporary care of children awaiting placement." This plan of organization has been copied in 28 other states.

Since then the child-placing idea has spread. In some places like Boston it has almost displaced the institutional care of needy children. But the present methods of this work are very different from the "emigrant parties" of the fifties; today the children are handled as individuals. Not every child for whom application is made is received; instead, their own home ties are preserved wherever possible. After acceptance, each child is studied by physician, psychologist or psychiatrist and social worker. Prospective homes are studied carefully, and children are placed "on probation" until it can be seen whether or not they and the foster homes are mutually adapted. Adoption takes place rather rarely and only after a considerable waiting period. Children in foster homes are carefully supervised, and to make this possible they are placed within limited areas.

A somewhat different type of agency is represented by the societies for prevention of cruelty to children and humane societies. These grew out of organizations which began with the effort to prevent cruelty to animals. Some of the societies still do both kinds of work, but in the main the children's work has broken off from the older organizations. The first of these strictly children's agencies was the New York Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, founded in 1874.

"The society was formed to rescue children from vicious and immoral surroundings and to prosecute offenders, to prevent the cruel neglect, beating or other abuse of children, to prevent the employment of children for mendicant purposes or in theatrical or acrobatic performances, and for the enforcement of all laws for the protection of minors from abuse."

Parallel with the growth of these private organizations has been the development of public child-caring agencies. Before the nineteenth century the only public provision for needy children was in almshouses and through the outdoor relief system which was brought over from England. There was also some supervision of indenture, but for the most part specialized work for children under public authority was entirely lacking.

The public care of children in the United States seems to have begun with the establishment of municipal orphan asylums; one was opened at Charleston, S. C., in 1794, and one in Philadelphia in 1820. After the middle of the century a number of states authorized the establishment of county children's homes. This movement began in Ohio in 1866, where the system grew rapidly until in 1901 there were 51 county homes sheltering 2250 children. The law intended the use of a placing-out system in connection with these institutions, but this seems to have been ignored for the most part. The example of Ohio was soon followed by Indiana and Connecticut, and to a lesser degree by other states.

In marked contrast to the county homes are the state schools established in Michigan, in 1873, and subsequently in Minnesota, Wisconsin, Rhode Island and several other states. The plan was to assemble all destitute children who became public charges in a central institution from which, as soon as possible, they should be placed out into

families. On the whole, these state school systems, which Homer Folks has described as " the distinctively American contribution to public systems of child saving," have functioned successfully.

It was really in Massachusetts that the first state school for destitute children was established, through the transfer to Monson in 1866 of " pauper children " in the other two state almshouses. In 1867 the State Board of Charity employed an agent to visit the children who had been indentured from the state almshouses and reform schools. From this has grown the Division of Child Guardianship of the Department of Public Welfare, through which the Commonwealth of Massachusetts does a regular child-placing work. Similar development has subsequently taken place in New Jersey, West Virginia and other states.

Another and much more recent form of state aid to needy children has been the so-called " mother's pension." The first scheme of this sort was developed in Missouri in 1911, and so rapidly did the idea spread that by 1919 similar laws had been enacted in 39 states. The purpose and nature of these " mothers' pensions " are indicated by the Illinois " funds to parents act," adopted in 1911.

" If the parent or parents of such dependent or neglected child are poor and unable to properly care for the said child, but are otherwise proper guardians and if it is for the welfare of such child to remain at home, the court may enter an order finding such facts and fixing the amount of money necessary. . . . . ."

CARE OF WAYWARD CHILDREN

A hundred years ago children caught violating the law were treated much as their elders. They were tried in the ordinary courts, and if found guilty were sentenced to jail or workhouse. In many of these prisons conditions were

fearfully bad even for adults; for children they were almost certain to do harm rather than good. Agitation started by John Howard and other prison reformers led not only to improvement of the correctional institutions for adults, but to the founding by philanthropists of private institutions for delinquent boys and girls.

Among the earliest of these "juvenile reformatories" in America were the New York House of Refuge, founded in 1824, the Boston House of Reformation dating from 1826, and the Philadelphia House of Refuge founded in the same year. The New York House of Refuge grew out of the efforts of the Society for the Prevention of Pauperism, which reported in 1819 concerning the Bellevue prison, "Here is one great school of vice and desperation; with confirmed and unrepentant criminals we place these novices in guilt—these unfortunate children from ten to fourteen years of age, who from neglect of parents, from idleness or misfortune, have been doomed to the penitentiary by condemnation of law." The first step, then, was the removal of youthful offenders to special institutions maintained by private charity.

The largest institution of this class is the New York Catholic Protectory, founded in 1863. It has always been administered on the congregate plan, with as high as 200 children in a single dormitory, but withal its wards appear to be well cared for. The teaching of trades has always been stressed, and in recent years the Protectory has established a placing-out agency.

Perhaps the most famous of these private, or semi-public, institutions for wayward children is the George Junior Republic, established at Freeville, New York, in 1894. The innovation of a large measure of self-government, while startlingly radical to the "old school" of reformatory officials, has justified itself in practise here

and has been imitated in numerous other institutions both public and private.

The first state institution for delinquent children was the Lyman School at Westboro, Massachusetts, which was opened in 1848. This was followed by similar state institutions in New York, Pennsylvania, Maine, Connecticut, and ultimately in nearly every state in the Union. The character of these early reform schools is thus described by Dr. Hastings H. Hart.

"Many of the juvenile reformatories were at first, in reality, juvenile prisons, with prison bars, prison cells, prison garb, prison labor, prison punishments and prison discipline generally. It was recognized as a legitimate part of the purpose of the institution to inflict upon the child punishment for his wrong-doing, adjusted according to the supposed ill desert of the culprit, and this idea was considered to be not inconsistent with the effort at reformation."

The school opened at Lancaster, Ohio, in 1856, introduced a different type which has since been copied in many states. It was "on the cottage plan," the object being to inject more of the features of family life, to encourage self-control in the boys and to separate them into grades. In the later schools for delinquent boys and girls complete elementary and secondary school systems, industrial training, organized recreation and sometimes a measure of self-government have come to occupy a large place in the reformation of wayward youth.

A later development in correctional work for children has been the introduction of parole or conditional release. In most cases children are committed to correctional institutions for the remainder of their minority, but instead of being turned suddenly back into the outside world, they are more frequently sent out on parole before attaining

majority. The granting of parole depends on progress made in the institution and on the existence of conditions outside—job, place to live, etc.—which indicate that the boy or girl is likely to "get along." During the period of parole certain conditions as to conduct are imposed and supervision is maintained either from the institution or through some state office through correspondence and the visits of a parole officer.

Still more recent is the development of probation and the juvenile court. The first probation law was enacted in Massachusetts in 1878, but the first separate juvenile court was established in Chicago in 1899. As distinguished from parole, probation means the care of the child otherwise than in an institution, and in lieu of being confined at all. The machinery of supervision is, however, much the same, except that it usually operates directly from the court. In the beginning most of the probation work was done by private agencies and individuals, but more and more it has been given over to public officers, especially since the development of "the juvenile court."

Among the main features of the juvenile court system as it has developed in the United States may be noted the following: (1) Separate hearings for children's cases, very often before a judge chosen for this specific purpose. (2) Informal or chancery proceedings, growing out of the fact that the child is no longer regarded as one who has committed a crime for which he must be punished. Instead of prosecution, the purpose of the juvenile court procedure is to determine whether the child is in need of the special care and guardianship of the state and to apply the remedies best calculated to remedy his condition. (3) Regular probation service both for investigation as an aid to the court and for supervision after a child has been declared a ward of the state. (4) Detention separate from adults, either

in juvenile detention homes or with private families. (5) Special court and probation records, both legal and social. (6) Provision for mental and physical examinations.

CARE OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

Until fairly recent times the blind, deaf-mutes, feeble-minded and epileptic were either neglected or treated indiscriminately along with all sorts of other needy folk. The education of the blind was first put on a solid basis by Valentin Haüy, an eighteenth century Frenchman. In the course of the nineteenth century numerous private institutions were established, and now nearly every American state makes public provision for the education of blind children either in special classes or in separate institutions. From being beggars and almshouse inmates for life, the blind have been gradually enabled to take their part in the community life along with the rest of us.

As early as 1570 Pedro de Ponce, a Spanish monk, taught four deaf and dumb pupils to speak, thus demonstrating that these handicapped folk had capacities beyond those of the idiots with whom they had often been classed. From Spain the idea of educating deaf-mutes spread to France and England whence it was brought to America. As in the case of the blind, we have some private institutions, and nearly every state provides for deaf-mutes either in special classes of the public school system or in separate institutions. Thus they too are enabled to share our common life.

Perhaps most striking of all has been the change of attitude toward the mentally deficient. Barr, in his "Mental Defectives," tells us of their exposure as infants at Sparta, their employment as jesters in medieval courts, the superstitious reverence which gave them in the middle ages the name "les enfants du bon Dieu," and a very different

attitude in Luther and Calvin, who denounced them as "Filled with Satan." In many cases they were not distinguished from the insane, and were treated as dangerous criminals.

The notion of educating the feeble-minded may be said to date from the effort of Itard in Paris to train the "wild boy of Aveyron." This boy was described as "unaccustomed to our food, and as selecting his aliment by the sense of smell; lying flat on the ground, and immersing his chin in the water to drink; tearing all sorts of garments, and trying constantly to escape; walking often on all fours; fighting with his teeth; giving few marks of intelligence; having no articulate language, and even appearing devoid of natural speech; complaisant and pleased at receiving caresses." Itard was greatly disappointed at his inability after five years to educate this boy, but he did discover and publish valuable data.

During the early part of the nineteenth century a number of private institutions were opened in France, Switzerland, Germany and England. Not distinguishing between different grades of mental deficiency, many of the pioneers were oversanguine as to the possibility of training their charges. Thus Saegert's school in Berlin was called an "Institution for the Cure and Education of Idiots." However, this was a valuable reaction against previous attitudes toward the feeble-minded, because it has since been found that some of these unfortunates can profit from a measure of education.

The pioneer in America seems to have been Samuel G. Howe, Director of the Perkins Institution for the Blind at Watertown, Massachusetts. His interest having been aroused through three blind children who were also feeble-minded, Dr. Howe got the matter before the legislature, which appointed an investigating committee in 1846. This

committee's report " showed a thorough investigation into the nature, causes and various forms of idiocy, and gave a full statement of conditions and treatment of 514 idiots in various almshouses and private families in Massachusetts." The result was an appropriation for an experimental school to be conducted by Dr. Howe, and in 1850 the incorporation of the Massachusetts School for Idiotic and Feeble-minded Children.

Numerous private institutions followed, but the most important development in America has been the gradual assumption by our state Governments of responsibility for the care and training of the feeble-minded. The public provision has included not only " asylums " and state training schools, but also special classes in the public schools and supervision of mental defectives who are capable of being employed in agriculture or industry.

The scientific study of the feeble-minded received what is probably its greatest stimulus at the very end of the last century in the elaboration by Binet and Simon in France of a scale for measuring intelligence. This scale has since been revised by its authors and by several others, notably Goddard in New Jersey and Terman in California. While no scheme of rating the mental capacity of human beings is wholly satisfactory even to those who have devised and used it, enough has been learned through the use of these tests to justify the classification of the feeble-minded into several grades. An idiot is defined as " a person so deeply defective in mind from birth, or from an early age, that he is unable to guard himself against common physical dangers." His " mental age " is two years or less. The middle grade or imbecile is " one who, by reason of mental defect existing from birth, or from an early age, is unable to earn his own living, but is capable of guarding himself against common physical dangers." His " mental age " is

from three to seven. The highest grade, known in America as the "moron," is defined as "one who is capable of earning a living under favorable circumstances, but is incapable from mental defect, existing from birth, or from an early age, (a) of competing on equal terms with his normal fellows; or (b) of managing himself and his affairs with ordinary prudence." His "mental age" is eight to twelve.

Public attention to the mentally and physically handicapped has passed beyond the stage of superstition and neglect. Custodial care in institutions is the second stage, and beyond this the treatment of the most helpless cannot go. Others whom it seems unwise to leave "at large" lest they fall into pauperism or crime or bring into the world defective offspring may be happy and useful in institutional colonies. But through specialized treatment more and more of these unfortunates are being enabled to participate in our common life. Special education, vocational training and guidance enable most of the blind and the deaf-mutes to become successful and respected members of the community. Registration and supervision render it not only safe but wise for certain mental defectives to mingle with "normal" folk.

CONTROL OF CHILD LABOR

"The beginning of the present (nineteenth) century found children of five, and even three years of age, in England, working in factories and brickyards; women working underground in mines harnessed with mules to carts, drawing heavy loads; found the hours of labor whatever the avarice of individual mill-owners might exact, were it thirteen, or fourteen, or fifteen; found no guards about machinery to protect life and limb; found the air of

the factory fouler than language can describe, even could human ears bear to hear the story."

In these words Francis Walker described a condition which was never quite so bad in America, but which has commanded the attention of philanthropists and public spirited citizens on both sides of the Atlantic down to the present time.

Most active in the agitation concerning child labor in the United States have been the child labor committees, labor unions, women's trade union leagues, consumers' leagues, women's clubs of various kinds and state labor bureaus. The National Child Labor Committee was organized in 1904 and has carried its investigations and propaganda into almost every state of the Union. It makes studies of conditions affecting the employment of children, undertakes to educate the public through pamphlets, public addresses and exhibits, and tries to secure legislation. In many states there are local child labor committees associated with the national organization; to them much of the success in controlling child labor is due. Next to the child labor committees in influence and effectiveness should probably be placed the consumers' leagues. Here the method has been that of organizing consumers in order through their united efforts to insist upon the manufacture and sale of products under satisfactory conditions.

In response to such agitation there grew up during the nineteenth century in Great Britain a code of factory laws regulating, among other things, the labor of children. In the United States most of the child labor laws have been enacted since 1895. At the present time every state regulates in some way the employment of minors, and several states have child labor laws that seem fairly complete and rather well enforced. These laws in general deal with (a) the age below which employment is forbidden, this age

being fourteen in a growing number of states; (b) ages between which employment can be secured only under certain conditions including frequently the securing of a certificate, these ages being commonly fourteen to sixteen; (c) the hours of labor of children, frequently forbidding night work and often limiting the hours to eight per day; (d) the requirement of a minimum attendance at school and sometimes educational tests. Such laws vary greatly from state to state; hence the efforts to standardize them. Twice the Congress of the United States has enacted a Federal child labor law, but each time the courts have declared it to be unconstitutional on the ground of being an unwarranted invasion of states' rights.

OTHER PHASES OF THE CHILD WELFARE MOVEMENT

There are many other phases of the child welfare movement of the nineteenth century; to most of them space forbids more than passing reference. Among the most important are the developments in the field of education. Starting often under private auspices, new schools and new methods have in general after the experimental and demonstration stages been taken over by the public. Thus Jefferson's " free schools for pauper children " have become the public elementary schools of Virginia; the denominational academies scattered over the country a generation ago have become or given way to the public high schools. Private initiative has produced school lunches, clothing for poor children, school nursing and often the much-needed improvements in physical equipment. Among the more important organizations to be considered in this connection are the parent-teachers' associations, mothers' clubs, coöperative educational associations, child study clubs, etc.

Another group of efforts might be classed together

under the head of "child hygiene." Here we have in mind milk funds, baby-saving campaigns, baby clinics, compulsory vaccination, medical and dental examinations, instruction in hygiene in the schools, organized and supervised recreation, the physical examination of school children, etc. As noted in the chapter on correlation of social agencies, there is a host of organizations at work in this field, but more and more the functions involved are being performed by nation, state and municipality.

One of the most interesting of recent developments has been the effort to unify or at least to correlate legislation and public agencies dealing with children. This began officially with the appointment in 1911 of the Commission to Codify and Revise the Laws of Ohio Relative to Children, which was followed in 1913 by the enactment of a so-called children's code. Since that time definite action toward the comprehensive study of legislation affecting children has been made in thirty other states. In all this movement the most potent single factor has probably been the Federal Children's Bureau exercising its influence especially through investigations and various kinds of publicity.

Throughout the last hundred years of child welfare work two tendencies seem to stand out above all others. One is the giving way of a more or less sentimental interest in "child-saving" before the gradual rise of scientific study and provision for all children. The other is the gradual taking over by the public service of methods and agencies which were experimentally developed and demonstrated under private auspices. Here as in other fields of social work, we seem to see the passing of charity and the growth of professional public service.

SUGGESTED READINGS

Payne, George Henry: *The Child in Human Progress.* New York: Putnam, 1916.

History of Child-Saving in the United States. Report of the committee on the history of child-saving work to the National Conference of Charities and Corrections, 1893. Boston: G. H. Ellis, 1893.

Folks, Homer: *The Care of Destitute, Neglected and Delinquent Children.* New York: Macmillan, 1902.

Hart, Hastings H.: *Preventive Treatment of Neglected Children.* New York: Charities Publication Committee, 1910.

Mangold, George B.: *Problems of Child Welfare.* New York: Macmillan, 1914.

Brace, Charles L.: *The Dangerous Classes of New York and Twenty Years' Work Among Them.* New York: Wynkoop & Hallenbeck, 1880.

Adams, T. S., and Sumner, Helen L.: *Labor Problems.* New York: Macmillan, 1905. (Chap. 2 deals with child labor.)

Barr, Martin W.: *Mental Defectives, Their History, Treatment and Training.* Philadelphia: Blakiston, 1910, Chap. 2.

Wiltse, Sarah E.: "*Preliminary Sketch of the History of Child-study in America.*" Pedagog. Seminary, 3, 189–212 (1894).

White House Conference on the Care of Dependent Children. Washington: Gov't Printing Office, 1909.

Annotated Subject Index and Order List of Books and Pamphlets, including Government Reports, on *Maternity and Child Welfare in England and Scotland.* A. R. C. 1011. Aug., 1920. Washington: Amer. Red Cross, 1920.

Children's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor. Various publications.

See reports of various children's agencies, *e.g.*, New York Children's Aid Society, Massachusetts Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Children, Illinois Children's Home Society, New England Home for Little Wanderers, New York Catholic Protectory, New Jersey State Board of Children's Guardians, National Child Labor Committee, National Society for the Study and Prevention of Infant Mortality (now American Child Hygiene Association), Coöperative Education Association of Virginia.

PART III

THE ENGLISH POOR LAW

CHAPTER X

THE BACKGROUND OF THE ENGLISH POOR LAW

THE modern development of public relief of the poor seems to have taken place at about the same time in several countries of northern Europe. In France, Germany, Switzerland and England systems for the care of the poor either by the state or under its direction were initiated early in the sixteenth century, during or immediately following the Protestant Reformation. We shall, here, devote our attention largely to the development of the English Poor Law, partly because it has had a more steady growth and partly because it has influenced social work in America much more than have the Continental systems.

The contributions of the English Poor Law to modern social work may be summarized under three heads. First, it represents the development of a technique of relief-giving, including organization and administration and methods of dealing with those in need. To be sure, the techniques of today are by no means exclusively drawn from the English Poor Law, nor have the experiments of the English officials been uniformly successful. Nevertheless, a very real and important contribution has been made here toward the development of a technique.

Second, the English Poor Law represents the development of a consciousness of national responsibility for dealing with the problems of poverty. This began with the

effort of the state to attach the individual to the local parish, and to repress begging. From these it went on to define and regulate the relief which was actually administered by the units of local government. Later, it organized a national system of relief. Finally, it led to old age pensions, and health and unemployment insurance as parts of a national program to diminish the amount of poverty and misery.

The third contribution of the English Poor Law system, as we interpret it, is the development of a consciousness of the futility of mere relief. There is some disagreement as to whether the English system has actually worked out to this conclusion. But the Poor Law report of 1909 and the passing of such laws as those just mentioned seem to be pretty clear evidence that out of the four hundred years of the English Poor Law, there has actually come a recognition of the inadequacy of charity and the necessity for devising preventive and constructive measures.

MEDIEVAL FIXITY

In order to understand the origin of the English Poor Law, it is necessary to anticipate briefly the discussion of medieval charities which is to follow. Speaking in very general terms, people in the middle ages were pretty definitely fixed as to geographical situation, occupation and social status. They lived for the most part in little neighborhood groups where everyone knew everyone else, and where in time of accident or other misfortune there was no need for organized charity because neighborliness manifested itself in the form of mutual aid.

Not only did people actually live in a state of fixity and relative isolation, but it was generally assumed that this was the only proper way to do. The laws of the early kings of England throw interesting light on this notion

that everyone belonged in a definite place and should "stay put." Our Saxon ancestors required every peasant who had no home of his own to find some householder who should be responsible for him. Without such surety, he would not be regarded as a member of the community nor entitled to its protection. Similar laws appeared in the tenth century in the time of King Aethelstan, and in the eleventh century in the reign of King Canute.

These laws seem to give expression to a popular feeling that the normal thing was for each individual to have a definite place in some primary group, a manor, parish, guild, or religious community. As a matter of fact, in the earlier middle ages the numbers of detached persons remained relatively small, and it was perfectly natural that there should be a continual effort to preserve the status quo. But as the middle ages advanced the wanderers multiplied and it was necessary to provide measures for their care in time of misfortune.

ROYAL ALMS

The first attention of the Anglo-Saxon kings to the poor was not public relief as we use that term, but rather the casual alms of a great overlord. For example, Bede tells the following story of King Oswald. He was about to dine sumptuously from a silver dish of dainties one Sunday, when the servant who attended to relief of the poor told him that there were many persons outside the gate who were begging alms. Thereupon the king ordered the contents to be carried to the beggars. King Aethelstan ordered the distribution of much alms to the poor. He ordered each of his Reeves every year to redeem one penal slave, and to furnish the necessary food for one poor Englishman. King Alfred, we are also told, bestowed alms in largesses on both natives and foreigners of all

countries. In making these gifts to the poor, the kings of England were acting as individuals rather than as representatives of the state. They were doing just exactly the sort of thing that nobles and prelates were all indulging in.

REPRESSIVE MEASURES

Among the earliest official acts with reference to the poor, and logically antecedent to the poor laws, were the repressive measures affecting labor. As a result of the Black Death about 1347, the number of laborers was considerably decreased, and the survivors demanded higher wages. Hence, Parliament, being composed largely of landlords, was interested in restoring the old status in which they had the laborers under their thumb. They were face to face with a novel problem in which they had to take some definite account of the landless class. They met the situation with the Statute of Laborers, 23 Edward III, 1349. The asking of alms by "valiant beggars" and the giving of alms to them were forbidden. Also, "every man and woman, of whatsoever condition, free or bond, able in body, and within the age of three score years, not living in merchandise, nor exercising any craft, nor having of his own whereof he may live, nor proper land about whose tillage he may himself occupy, and not serving any other, shall be bound to serve him which shall him require, and take only the wages, livery, meed or salary which were accustomed to be given in the places where he oweth to serve." This put the laborer who stood out for higher wages in the same class with the professional beggar.

This law was very difficult to enforce, and it was followed by other and still harsher measures: 25 Edward III, 1350-1; 34 Edward III, 1360. Still many refused to work; vagrancy and crime increased, and in 1381 Wat

Tyler's rebellion broke out. In the Statute of 1388 (12 Richard II), the attempt was made to bind the poor to the place of their birth. After providing for persons able to work, it was directed "that beggars impotent to serve shall abide in the cities and towns where they be dwelling at the time of the proclamation of this statute." This is the first legislative mention of the "impotent poor" as a distinct class; but no provision was made for their relief; they were left to chance alms for their support.

There is quite a series of similar enactments: 7 Henry V; 11 Henry VII, 1495; 19 Henry VII, cap. 12, 1503; 22 Henry VIII, 1531. These measures mark a sharp cleavage between the landowning and the landless classes. The propertied caste was compelled by the scarcity of labor and by the demonstrations of the unpropertied to take some notice of the latter. The first attitude was that of hostility, but for economic reasons the rich could not get along without the laborers, hence some technique had to be found for dealing with them, since the old one had broken down. It was a very acute problem. These "vagabonds" were going about through the country in troops, begging, or rather demanding and stealing. "In the sixteenth century the beggars became a positive terror to quiet folk." The old technique of winning salvation through alms might do for the "impotent poor," but it was of little value in handling the "valiant beggars." The new technique involved a relationship closely akin to that of slavery, that is, it was an effort to return to serfdom. An effort was made to treat the laborers as property, but in the sixteenth century this was doomed to at least partial failure. The landless class was too strong.

Such repressive measures as these were by no means peculiar to England. Don Ferdinand IV, of Spain, ordered, in 1308, that vagrants were to be driven from all

his cities, and if they returned they were to be flogged. Don Pedro I published a similar ordinance in 1351 against all able-bodied beggars and professional criminals. Don Juan I gave anyone the right to compel a vagabond to work for him a month, giving him in return only enough to eat and drink. Later ordinances were still more severe. Cutting off of ears and even death were prescribed for able-bodied beggars in 1400 by Enrique III. The actual practice, however, was not so severe, for largesses and begging continued because public opinion supported them.

France also undertook to meet the problem presented by hordes of insistent beggars by methods almost identical to those utilized in England and Spain. In 1350, King John ordered that all idlers, gamblers, fortune tellers and beggars should leave the city of Paris and the surrounding region within three days. Failure to comply with this order was to be punished by imprisonment and corporal punishment. In the case of recidivism, the offenders were sentenced to the pillory, branded on the forehead and permanently banished.

The interesting thing is that these repressive measures of the kings occurred at about the same time in those countries of western Europe which were beginning to develop strong central governments. In addition to endeavoring to repress begging, the royal power also undertook the regulation of ecclesiastical and private charities. Thus, a statute of Richard II in 1388 regulated the revenues of the Church in the interests of the poor. "A portion of the tithe had been commonly distributed by the resident rector to the poor, but, when a living became part of the possessions of a monastery, a portion of the revenue should be assigned to the poor, so that they might not lose the alms formerly distributed by the rectors."

A statute of Henry V, enacted in 1414, recites numbers

of abuses in the hospitals of that day and required that the "ordinaries should enquire of the manner of the foundation of the estate and governance of the same. . . . . and upon that make correction and reformation."

Another activity of the king in his capacity as representative of the nation, which lasted into the fourteenth century, was the guardianship of the insane. This seems to have been essentially feudal in character, and may have been persisted in because the king enjoyed the revenue from his wards' lands. Sometimes the king would exempt a hospital from taxation; sometimes he would grant special privileges. As an example of these last, we find that King John, in 1204, conferred upon the lepers of Shrewsbury the privilege of taking handfulls of corn and flour from sacks exposed in the market.

BREAK-UP OF FEUDALISM

These various activities of the early kings and parliaments are interesting and worthy of our attention because they must have influenced later efforts to deal with the problems of poverty. But it seems hardly likely that they would of their own accord have developed into a national system of poor relief. The Poor Law came into existence for a number of reasons, chief among which, apparently, was the economic disorganization attendant upon the growth of the domestic system of industry, the enclosures of small land holdings and the general breaking up of feudalism. The economic changes which were taking place created social disorganization, broke up the old, relatively fixed order of things, increased mobility, and set many individuals adrift. Second among the important causes of poverty, at the opening of the sixteenth century, was the failure of the established charities. Third, we may note the series of disturbances connected with the Protestant

Reformation, including in England the dissolution of the monasteries. Finally, the growing spirit of nationalism, and, for a time, the great power of the English sovereign contributed largely toward making poor relief a function of the state.

RISE OF THE DOMESTIC SYSTEM OF INDUSTRY

The domestic system, to which reference has just been made, can be more adequately understood after studying the medieval gilds which preceded it. However, it is enough at this point simply to say that previously manufacturing had been almost entirely done by members of craft gilds who were very much under the control of their organizations. The most important manufacture for England seems to have been cloth. English merchants were successful in their foreign trade largely by the export of woolen cloth; and because of their success, accumulated a fund of capital which they turned back into the industry. In order to secure more cloth and to control for their own purposes the methods of manufacture, the "merchant-clothiers" developed what has come to be called the "domestic system." They purchased the wool and gave it out to carders or combers, spinners, weavers, fullers and others, who worked in their home shops in rural hamlets. Apparently, it was necessary for the "merchant-clothiers" to have this work done outside the larger towns, where the gild regulations were generally very irksome. They seem to have secured the labor largely from the unemployed of the agricultural districts, and obtained the necessary technical teaching from the journeymen, whom the restriction of gild privileges within the towns had rendered dissatisfied with their prospects. The important thing, however, is that the people who were secured occupied an intermediate position in the process of cloth making. They received

the raw material from the "merchant-clothiers," and after working it up, returned it to them for marketing. Frequently, if not generally, the artisans lived in their own homes in what would now be called garden cities. They usually owned their own looms and had their plots of ground, on which they cultivated small gardens and raised poultry and cows.

But evidently this situation was by no means universal, for as time went on, some of the "merchant-clothiers" went so far as to own and provide the artisan's tools. Others set up in their own houses a considerable number of looms, and seemed to be well on the way toward a factory system of production. It is possible that the Industrial Revolution of the late eighteenth century might have been advanced two hundred years, but for legislative action such as the Weavers' Act of 1555. This same Act was also directed against some definite abuses on the part of "merchant-clothiers," such as acquiring possession of the looms and letting them out at unreasonable rents, or reducing the rate of pay for working up the cloth.

So far, it would seem that the establishment of the domestic system must have been advantageous to the people whom it affected, rather than otherwise. As a matter of fact, it did help to absorb the surplus labor which was being discharged from the agricultural estates, but at the same time, it gave rise to a new sort of problem in the form of unemployment.

With the widening of the market, there came an extension and an intensification of all the evils, due to the imperfect coincidence of supply and demand. Sometimes these were due to economic and sometimes to political causes. An example of the latter appeared in 1527–28. Wolsey, in order to gain a political end, prohibited trade with The Netherlands. There immediately arose a com-

plaint from the merchants that they could find no sale for their wares. At the same time, the clothiers were no longer able to employ the craftsmen, and great numbers of men were thrown out of work. The people began to rise in rebellion, especially in the South and West. Wolsey saw himself compelled to yield, but not before much suffering was caused.

ENCLOSURES OF FARM LAND

Directly correlated with the industrial change from the gild to the domestic system, there was another economic change from a feudal system of agriculture to a commercialized type of stock raising. The great demand for wool and the high prices offered by the clothiers made it very profitable for the English landowners to turn their fields into pastures and to raise sheep instead of grain. Now, in order to accomplish this purpose, they had to upset the entire feudal system of tillage, and in fact, the whole round of life of those people who lived on the great rural estates. In an earlier time, the landlords had lived upon their estates, parcelling them out in many small tracts to what were known as "customary tenants." These tenants each tilled a number of narrow strips in the various common fields, and grazed their flocks on the common meadows, in return for which they rendered specified services on that part of the estate which the landlord reserved for himself.

In the later middle ages, money payments came to be substituted for labor performed on the demesne, or the lord's own part of the estate. In turn the lord paid money wages for the work which he required, and these wages supplemented the income of small tenants. Now it seems to have been the demesne that the owners first turned into pasture. As a consequence, the small tenants lost a por-

tion of their income and were sometimes forced to look elsewhere for a living. Moreover, the enclosures threw out of employment a considerable number of agricultural laborers. The second step seems usually to have been the enclosure of the common meadows. The monopolization by the lord's flocks of the common pasture furnished an important cause of popular discontent.

But that which most disturbed the habits of working and of living was the enclosure of the common fields. Where each man worked a number of narrow strips in the various fields of the estate, subject to a common rotation of crops, there was little opportunity for individual initiative or for the improvement of agricultural methods. The arrangement now came to be that each tenant occupied a smaller number of fields, or perhaps even a single plot of ground, and some of these plots were taken over by the landlord for use as pasture. This meant an almost violent upsetting of all the habits of life, as well as the economic displacement of an increasing number of tenants.

This displacement came about in a variety of ways. Sometimes it took the form of the violent ousting of the occupant, sometimes it was the substitution of a short-time lease for the customary holding, and sometimes it was a refusal on the death of one tenant to admit his son, who in earlier centuries would have been treated as the natural successor.

Ashley takes pains to point out that for the most part these enclosures were entirely legal and a perfectly natural procedure; albeit, they did produce a great deal of maladjustment and suffering. According to Ashley, the landlords were usually entirely within their legal rights when they forced out the tenants. The cultivators of the soil had always been dependents and held their lands by the will of the lords. For centuries the lords knew no other

way of cultivating their land and had no wish to get rid of their tenants. Probably the "customary" manner of holding land was on the point of becoming law when a change in the economic situation, that is, the increasing advantage of pasture over tillage, prompted the lords to fall back on their old rights. At all events, these important displacements did take place from about 1470 to 1530, and contributed largely to the group of problems which the English Poor Law was designed to solve.

DISMISSAL AND ESCAPE OF RETAINERS

It seems, moreover, that others than the tenants were ejected and driven into the groups of detached and unemployed persons. Sir Thomas More mentions the dismissal of retainers by nobles who were no longer able to support them. He speaks of great trains of "idle and loitering serving men," whom wealthy gentlemen "carried about with them at their tails." "They never learned any craft whereby to get their livings. These men, as soon as their master is dead or be sick themselves, be incontinent thrust out of doors. . . . . Many times the dead man's heir is not able to maintain so great a house and keep so many serving men as his father did. Then in the mean season, they that be thus destitute of service either starve of hunger or manfully play the thieves." The vigorous action of Henry VII and the Star Chamber in enforcing the law against "livery" must have thrown many men of this sort out of service to prey upon the public.

Finally, we should not fail to take account of one other aspect of the breaking up of feudalism. The freedom and many comforts enjoyed by the persons residing in a town, would naturally excite a desire for similar enjoyments in the rural population, then in state of servile dependence, and possessing scarcely any of the comforts and few of

the conveniences of life. If a villein succeeded in acquiring a little property, he was driven to conceal it, as, if discovered, it would belong to his master; and in order to preserve it he would probably take the first opportunity of escaping to a town, where if he could conceal himself from the pursuit of his lord for a year and a day, he would be free forever. But emancipation removed the lord's responsibility for the laborer, and cut the freedman loose from his neighbors on the manor, and often from his family. Hence poverty was likely to become real and relief necessary. Many of those who had struggled for and asserted their own freedom, resorted to begging and vagabondism, and not infrequently to violence, whenever employment or the means of honest livelihood was not readily obtainable, and sometimes, perhaps, when it was.

DISSOLUTION OF THE MONASTERIES

Some historians, anxious to condemn public relief systems and to defend ecclesiastical charities, have maintained that the dissolution of the monasteries by Henry VIII was the chief cause of distress at the time of the enactment of the first Poor Law. Other churchmen, however, who appear to be more candid, if not better informed, admit that the almsgiving of the monasteries and similar medieval institutions had failed utterly as a means of caring for the poor, and contributed largely to the professionalizing of beggary.

Fuller, in his "Church History," printed in 1656, after lauding the hospitality of abbeys as "beyond compare," thus speaks of these institutions: "Some," he says, "will object that this their hospitality was but charity mistaken, promiscuously entertaining some who did not need and more who did not deserve it. Yea, these abbeys did but maintain poor which they made. For some vagrants,

accounting abbey alms their own inheritance, served an apprenticeship, and afterwards wrought journeywork, to no other trade than begging; all whose children were, by their father's copie, made free of the same company. Yea, we may observe that generally such places wherein the great abbeys were seated swarm most with poor people at this day, as if beggary were entailed upon them, and that laziness not as yet got out of their flesh, which so long since was bred in their bones."

As we shall see further on, not only the monasteries but the hospitals and the parochial relief had broken down before the passage of the Poor Law. In the meantime, Henry VIII, envious of the abbeys' wealth and at outs with the Pope, undertook to destroy the monasteries. What came to pass through the dissolution was that the volume of poverty and vagrancy was rendered more apparent. Moreover, the burden of pauperism was in a sense increased, for the beggars and loafers who had previously managed to get a livelihood by going about from monastery to monastery, had become more than ever troublesome to quiet folk.

When it is said that the dissolution made the Poor Law necessary, what is usually meant is that the monasteries had previously furnished an adequate organization for the relief of all such distress as misfortune brought upon the laboring population, but there seems to be exceedingly little evidence of this. No matter how strongly we may condemn the motives and methods of the dissolution, it at least had this good result that it abolished a number of centers of pauperization.

We have seen how the economic changes, the religious disturbances and the failure of established charities created a very difficult situation. But these alone do not account for the rise of a Poor Law and a national system

of relief. We have accounted for the need of something new; let us see if we can find a reason for the state becoming the agent for its administration.

GROWTH OF NATIONALISM

Our clue to the explanation of this last fact is that the Poor Law was simply one aspect of the growing nationalism. Before the sixteenth century, England was much less a nation than from that time on. Economically, she was a group of more or less independent and self-sufficing local units. Politically, there was relatively little unity. The national government was not so strong nor did it occupy so much of men's attention as later came to be the case.

However, from the beginning of the fourteenth century, there had been developed a "national economy" as distinguished from a merely "town economy." But the parliamentary movement of the fourteenth century was premature. The increase in the quantity of legislation was not accompanied by an equal increase in the control of local by central authorities, while the weak rule of the Lancastrians and the dynastic feuds of the fifteenth century left the towns pretty free to pursue their own interests. In fact, economic development had hardly reached the point at which there was urgent need for an organization wider than that of the town.

But in the sixteenth century, the medieval town system gave way in every direction, and its place was gradually occupied by an organization of trade and industry which rested on the wider basis of a national state. The constantly increasing activity of parliament in enacting laws prescribing the methods of industry, and applicable to the whole kingdom, is evident on every side. Frequently, this

legislation was passed in the interest of the towns themselves, as over against the new domestic system which was developing in the rural villages. But often, it seems to have been primarily the result of having a stronger central government, conscious of its own sphere of action. Moreover, the constant interference by and appeal to an authority outside the town must have drawn men's thoughts away from the latter and toward the nation as an object of attention.

Some of the other factors in the development of nationalism were the outcome of the Hundred Years' War with France, the destruction of many noble families in the Wars of the Roses, and the appeal which Henry VII's regime of "law and order" made to the new commercial and manufacturing classes.

There were, at this time, three other countries of western Europe in which a national spirit and a strong central government had been developed. These were France, Spain and Portugal. The causes which lay behind nationalism in these countries were very similar to those which operated in the case of England. But of the three, France was the only one which, in this period, introduced a system of compulsory assessment for the relief of the poor.

THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION

The French effort in this direction seems not to have lasted long. But in Germany, where a national consciousness was less definitely organized, there was a rapid development of public relief administered by local units of government. This fact suggests that in England the religious change was no less important than the political. In fact, the Reformation meant an important change in

policy for all the Protestant countries. Previously almost all charity had rested on the doctrine of the religious merit of almsgiving carefully and continually taught by the Catholic Church. Philanthropy was held to be strictly an ecclesiastical function. But amid the religious upheavals of northern Europe, it gradually became a secular and a civil affair. To be sure, the state made use of the ecclesiastical machinery for the administration of relief, but with the separation from Rome and a lessened emphasis on alms as a means of salvation, the machinery slowly lost its relation to the church. The parish became a unit of civil government, and in general the state assumed the position formerly held by the Pope. Hospitals that had been religious establishments were taken over by the towns or by other secular agencies.

The background, then, of the English Poor Law consists first in the important economic and social changes, producing disorganization to an extent previously unknown in that country. In the second place, it involves the failure of the ecclesiastical system of charity, which will be more adequately described in subsequent chapters. Finally, it includes the growing spirit of nationalism, which marks the sixteenth century in western Europe.

SUGGESTED READINGS

Ashley, W. J.: *An Introduction to English Economic History.* London: Longmans Green, 1893, 2 vols.

Chapin, F. Stuart: *An Historical Introduction to Social Economy.* New York: Century, 1917, Chapters 12, 13, 17.

Cheyney Edward P.: *An Introduction to the Industrial and Social History of England.* New York: Macmillan, 1920.

Cunningham, William: *The Growth of English Industry and Commerce.* Cambridge: University Press, 1890–1903. 3 vols.

Eden, Frederick M.: *The State of the Poor; or an History of the Labouring Classes in England from the Conquest to the Present Period.* London, 1797.

Hayes, Carlton J. H.: *A Political and Social History of Modern Europe.* New York: Macmillan, 1916, vol. 1.
More, Sir Thomas: *Utopia.* New York: Macmillan, 1895.
Powers, G. W.: *England and the Reformation.* New York: Scribners, 1905.
Ribton-Turner, C. J.: *A History of Vagrants and Vagrancy and Beggars and Begging.* London: Chapman & Hall, 1887.
Slater, Gilbert: *The Making of Modern England.* Boston, 1913.
Usher, A. P.: *Industrial History of England.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1920.

CHAPTER XI

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ENGLISH POOR LAW

THE FIRST POOR LAW

Professor Ashley regards the Act of 1536 as the beginning of the English Poor Laws. Its object, as expressed again and again, was that none should "go openly begging." To this end, the local authorities were charitably to receive, and then to "succor, find and keep" all the "impotent poor" belonging to their district. The necessary means were to be provided by the collection of alms in church on every Sunday, holiday, or festival, in "common boxes" provided for the purpose. The clergy were bidden, "as well in their sermons, collations, biddings of the beads as in time of confessions," and at the making of wills or testaments of any persons, to exhort their flocks to show charity.

The Act altogether forbade "common and open doles" on the two grounds that the gathering together of the recipients led to the spread of infectious diseases, and "that most commonly unto such doles many persons resort who have no need of the same." "No person shall make any common dole or shall give any ready money in alms otherwise than to the common boxes and common gatherings."

In dealing with the "valiant beggars," the Act was less complete. In the repressive laws, which had previously been passed, it had been ordered that if found begging they should be whipped and ordered off to their own parishes. There was now added a provision for their benefit, to the

effect that on producing a testimonial of having been thus whipped and sent on, they should be given food and lodging every ten miles. If they loitered on the way, a part of the right ear was to be cut off; and if they offended again, they were to suffer death as felons. If they did finally get home, there was only the vague direction that the alms of the parish collected in the "common box" were also to be used "for setting and keeping to work the able poor."

There are several important features of this Act of 1536 which left Henry VIII with a somewhat better reputation than might otherwise be the case. First of all, it adds to the merely repressive measures an attempt to do something positive for the relief of the poor. Secondly, instead of merely confining begging to the "impotent poor," it lays down the general principle that no one shall be permitted to beg. The care of the destitute was definitely required, and when this was once understood, it was a natural corollary to introduce a compulsory assessment if voluntary contributions were not sufficient. Finally, as there was a perception of the fact that the able-bodied may not always be able to find employment, there was added the requirement that the parish should furnish work to the able-bodied persons who might be in need. This Act lays down the general principles which governed the subsequent development of the Poor Law, and may, therefore, be regarded as the foundation of the national system of relief in England.

There must have been a housing problem in the sixteenth century, with which we of the twentieth century can well sympathize. Curiously enough, this seems to have arisen in part from a law which provided that every cottage must have four acres of land attached to it. The assumption, apparently, was that this plot of ground would

provide the food required by one family. But it seems that one result of this law was that the supply of cottages, especially in the villages, was never sufficient because the yeomen and farmers were unwilling to lose the four acres of land which must be provided with each new cottage.

Therefore, in 1547, it was enacted that the local authorities should provide "tenantries, cottages and other convenient houses" for the lodging of the "impotent." These cottages were to be built on the common or waste ground of the community, provided the officers gained the consent of the lord of the manor.

But apparently, there was much difficulty in obtaining funds adequate for these purposes, and in 1555, it was felt necessary to enact "that if any person being able to further this charitable work do obstinately and frowardly refuse to give help to the poor, the parson, vicar or curate, or church wardens of the parish shall gently admonish him." If they failed, the bishop was to try his persuasive powers. If he was unsuccessful, it was added in 1563 that the "obstinate person" was to be bound over to the Justices of the Peace in rural districts, and to the mayors in towns who should have authority "to sesse, taxe, and lymit upon every such obstinate person . . . . . according to their good discretions, what sum (he) shall pay weekly towards the relief of the poor within the parish where he shall inhabit."

ELIZABETHAN LEGISLATION

It seems that in spite of all these efforts to compel payment to the parish officials for the relief of the poor the funds remained inadequate. The church collectors, in other words, were unsuccessful and probably resented. Possibly it had not been easy to procure men willing to undertake the collection and distribution of poor relief, so

in 1572 the second of the Elizabethan Poor Laws provided for the appointment of collectors and overseers as civil officers with power to compel men to serve in these positions for one year, or to forfeit the sum of ten shillings.

None of the laws previously passed had succeeded in preventing fraud and imposition by persons able to support themselves. As an effort to meet this situation, the Act of 1576 empowered the Justices in every county to purchase or hire buildings to be converted into houses of correction. They were to provide a stock of wool, hemp, flax, iron, or other stuff for the unemployed, "to the intent that they might be accustomed and brought up in labour and then not like to grow to be idle rogues; and that such as be already grown up in idleness and so rogues at this present may not have any just excuse in saying that they can not get any service or work."

Already there had come to be so many different laws relating to poverty and vagrancy that there was more or less confusion as to just what the administrative officers were supposed to do. Consequently, there was passed in 1598, and revised in 1601, an organic act which brought together the various provisions relating to the poor. First of all, these acts divided the recipients of relief into three classes—the able-bodied poor, those unable to work, and children. For the first class, work was to be furnished as under the law of 1576, and refusal was to be punished by stocks or imprisonment. For the "impotent poor," maintenance was provided in almshouses. Unless they were children whose parents or grandparents might be compelled to support them, dependent children were to be cared for by apprenticing them—the boys until they were twenty-four, and the girls until they were twenty-one or married.

The source of income was a tax to be levied and col-

lected weekly by overseers of the poor from every possessor of lands, houses, or tithes in the parish " in such competent sums as they shall think fit." If one parish were overburdened by its poor rate, the other parishes of the same hundred or county were to " rate in aid." It seems that the overseers could also draw upon two other sources of income:—lands or money left by charitable people for use by the poor, and fines for the breaking of certain laws.

As to administration, the office of collector was combined with that of overseer. For each parish there were a number of overseers, to which group the church wardens belonged ex officio, the remaining three or four being nominated at the vestry meeting. However, the overseers, as such, had no ecclesiastical duties, and the fact that their office was coming to be regarded as civil is shown by their appointment by the Justices of the Peace, even though their nomination was made at the vestry meeting.

This law was the core of English poor relief until 1834. By some, it seems to have been regarded as " a model for all time." But there were those even in the seventeenth century who criticized it severely. Thus complained Ralph Dunning, who was an overseer of a parish in Devon: " Loose, idle persons clamour for relief when they need none, and if their demands be not satisfied complain to the J.P's, who never do, nor can do less than order the Overseers to come before them to answer and shew cause, etc., and such Overseers as live far from the J.P. will often give the clamourers relief merely to save themselves a journey, especially when they have the wit to complain in a busy time."

The difficulty seems to have lain, at least partly, in the fact that the overseer was unpaid and had to make his living as a farmer or tradesman. His duties were altogether too extensive for an ordinary layman, and needed

the detailed attention of a permanent official. As a result, Dunning found that " the charge of the poor . . . . . is nearly double what it was thirty years since."

In 1630, an interesting step was taken in the direction of unifying the relief system. A Royal Commission for the Poor was appointed, and in the following year, this Commission issued a book of orders and directions to the Justices to insure the better administration of the Poor Law. The Justices were to report every three months to the Sheriff, who sent these reports through the Justices of Assize to the Lords Commissioners. If the Justices of the Peace were found negligent, this was to be reported to the King.

THE SETTLEMENT ACT

The first important alteration of the Law of 1601 came in 1662 in what is known as the Settlement Act of Charles II. It seems that poor people were crowding into parishes where relief was plentiful and easily secured. Moreover, it was true that outsiders who chanced to suffer misfortune in a given community were regarded as consuming the means of caring for the poor who lived in the parish. Also, there probably survived much of that medieval feeling that every man belonged in some particular place, and should remain there. At all events, the mobility of the poor created a problem which the Settlement Act undertook to solve.

By this law, the parish became responsible only for those who had legal domicile within its limits. Practically, this legal residence was restricted to those who were born or apprenticed in the parish, although in the first statement of the law, domicile might be acquired by proprietorship, sojourn, or service. Those who did not have legal residence could be removed to the parish to which they belonged,

within forty days of their coming to the new community. This action was taken by the Justice of the Peace, if, in his opinion, the new-comer was dependent or likely to become dependent. Moreover, any new arrival might be required to give surety that he would not become a charge upon the parish.

In one of its aspects, this law seems to have been an attempt to bind the laboring classes to the soil. At all events, it did restrict the mobility of labor and thereby hindered the growth of industry, caused unemployment, and probably increased the number of dependents. Not until 1795 was there any substantial change in the rigidity of the Settlement Law. In that year, expulsion from the parish was made permissible only when the person was actually dependent, and not then if the Justice of the Peace held the person unfit to travel. Lallemand, and other Catholic historians, make much of the hardships imposed by the Settlement Act, in support of their case that all relief work should be done by the Church, rather than by the State. They call attention to the terrible sufferings of the sick and aged who were driven from parish to parish, not only in England, but in Switzerland, Germany, and the other Protestant countries as well. Without necessarily accepting Lallemand's conclusions, we may properly accept his report of these evils as thoroughly in accord with the facts.

THE WORK-HOUSE TEST

The next step in the development of the English Poor Law may be described as the rise of the work-house. As we have already seen, there was careless parish administration of the funds, which produced increasingly heavy expense for the care of the poor. In 1691, an effort was made to meet this situation by requiring a register of

paupers and the amount of relief granted to them. This last was to be publicly examined at the annual vestry meeting, and no name was to be added during the year except by the authority of one or more Justices. However, very little advantage, if any, seems to have accrued from this piece of legislation, and the number of paupers kept on growing.

In 1697 a special Act of Parliament authorized the erection of a work-house in Bristol, where the local poor could be put at remunerative labor. This seems to have been sufficiently successful in reducing expenses to lead other communities to imitate the Bristol experiment. Because, however, some of the parishes were too small to maintain separate work-houses, it was provided, in 1723, that parishes might unite for this purpose, and "that no poor who refused to be lodged and kept in such houses should be entitled to ask for parochial relief." This provision acquired fame as the "Work-house Test." So far, the act might be held to have provided wisely.

But in another respect, it initiated a very serious evil. It permitted parishes to "farm out" the poor on contract. This simply meant in practise that the care of many indigents was let by contract to the lowest bidder. It meant, as a consequence, almost criminal exploitation and neglect, particularly of young children and very old people.

In 1782, what is known as Gilberts's Act abolished the "farming out" of the poor, and at the same time, initiated certain other reforms. In order further to reduce the expense of administering relief in small units, parishes were permitted to unite, not merely for the establishment and maintenance of work-houses, but also for the provision of out-relief (care of the poor in private homes). This Act also provided, for the first time, paid officials, known as "guardians," appointed by the Justices of the

Peace to administer both indoor (institutional) and outdoor relief. The assessment and collection of poor rates was left to the overseers. The whole procedure was to be supervised by the Justices, with the aid of visitors, whom they appointed. Unfortunately, this law was permissive rather than compulsory, and its provisions could be adopted only upon their acceptance by a two-thirds vote of the property owners in parishes which it was proposed to unite. As a result, the system never became widespread, although sixty-seven such unions were formed.

THE ALLOWANCE SYSTEM

Along with the reforms of Gilbert's Act, there went the establishment of what is commonly known as the "allowance system." It was an effort to mitigate the cruelties connected with the enforcement of the Settlement Act, and at the same time, to provide for those who were able to earn a part of their support. This law expressly stipulated that none but the old and infirm poor, the mothers of illegitimates, and children not yet able to work should be sent to the poorhouse. For the able-bodied poor work was to be found near their own homes by the "guardians," who were also to collect their wages for them and apply the same toward their support, supplementing any deficiency by a grant from the relief funds. This was the beginning of a system of wage subsidies, which, for a time, threatened to pauperize the entire wage-earning population of England.

This system of "allowances" seems to have reached its culmination in the so-called Berkshire plan of 1795. This scheme, which was not at first sanctioned by specific legislation, but was widely used, provided for the relief of all poor and industrious families whose income was charged to be insufficient. The amount of the "allow-

ance" was based on the price of wheat and the size of the family. In 1796, Parliament legalized the aid of able-bodied poor as a supplement to inadequate wages, and also rescinded the "Work-house Test."

The results were such as might be expected: (1) a tremendous increase in the amount expended for relief—from $10,000,000 in 1783 to $21,000,000 in 1803, and $39,000,000 in 1818; (2) a marked decrease in wages; and (3) evidence of a serious loss of independence, self-respect, self-control and efficiency in the laboring population. It was this situation which inspired the well-known essays of Malthus and popularized his theory of population.

But it would be a mistake to suppose that an unwise Poor Law unwisely administered was the sole cause of the evils indicated above. It should be remembered that this was the period of the Industrial Revolution and of the Napoleonic Wars. The latter meant the breaking up of many families, a heavy burden of taxes and high prices. The former meant a fairly complete economic and social disorganization, which we have discussed in Chapter V. The "enclosures," the factory system driving out the domestic system of manufacture, the rapid growth of towns and cities and the consequent changes in habits of living and working would of themselves have broken the morale of a large part of the population.

THE POOR LAW OF 1834

Whatever may have been the relative influence of these several factors, Parliament was moved to appoint an investigating committee in 1817. For some reason, all that came of it was the change of a few details in the Poor Law administration. But a second commission was appointed in 1832, which worked for two years and

brought in a report whose startling disclosures succeeded in stirring Parliament to action.

After presenting its findings, together with a large body of supporting evidence, the Commission offered three important recommendations which were the basis of the Law of 1834. It was proposed as a fundamental principle "that the condition of the paupers shall in no case be so eligible as the condition of persons of the lowest class subsisting on the fruits of their own industry." The re-establishment of the Work-house Test was recommended as the only means by which the principle of less eligibility could be practically enforced. Finally, in order that the relief afforded to each class of paupers might be uniform throughout the kingdom, the Commission recommended the establishment of a central board of control.

As a matter of fact, the new law did create a central authority consisting of three Poor Law Commissioners, who were given extensive power over local authorities to give orders and enforce regulations with minute supervision through inspectors and auditors. The Commissioners were authorized to divide the country into districts, which were called Poor Law Unions, to take the place of the parishes as units of administration. Each union was to have an unpaid Board of Guardians, which was to appoint paid executive officers.

But not even at the outset was the principle of national uniformity put into effect. The local authorities were often loathe to yield to the Commissioners, and the latter on their part seem to have been somewhat uncertain as to how far they should go in enforcing the "Principles of 1834." In 1842 they issued what was known as the Outdoor Labour Test Order, which permitted certain Poor Law Unions to give outdoor relief to able-bodied persons on condition of requiring a labor test. In 1844 they issued

an almost contradictory set of instructions known as the Outdoor Relief Prohibitory Order. This forbade outdoor relief to able-bodied persons except under very unusual circumstances. The General Consolidated Order of 1847 provided among other things for a single work-house in each union, to house all kinds and conditions of paupers. This, too, was a deviation from the recommendations of the report of 1834, which had urged a number of institutions for each union, making it possible to separate different groups of needy people—aged and infirm, children, sick, etc. This work-house was not intended to be used for the curative treatment of anyone. "It was to be a place which, whilst it provided the full requirements of physical health, starved both the will and the intelligence, and forced the pauper into a condition of blank-mindedness." Thus the principle of less eligibility was carried out, not by less food, inferior clothing, worse accommodations, etc., than were enjoyed by independent laborers, but by monotonous toil, lack of recreation, and absence of any mental stimulus.

NINETEENTH CENTURY DEVELOPMENTS

The law of 1834 was the basis of the English public relief system until very recently. To be sure, it was modified, from time to time, and what is more important, the administrative policies showed throughout the remainder of the century a steady, though unplanned drift away from the "Principles of 1834." In 1847 the Poor Law Commissioners were abolished and their duties transferred to the Poor Law Board under a minister responsible to Parliament. In 1871, these activities together with those pertaining to sanitation and public works were transferred to the new Local Government Board. The purpose of this consolidation was to overcome

the confusion arising out of the fact that several divisions of the national government were dealing with the local authorities.

Two important supplementary pieces of legislation dealt with the law of "settlement" and the unit of taxation. The Act of 1795 had not succeeded in eliminating the evils attendant upon the transportation of the poor from parish to parish, so that there was passed in 1846 a new law known as the Irremovable Poor Act. This law forbade the removal of a dependent person who had lived in a parish for five years. A later amendment reduced this time to one year. The unequal burden on the various parishes was supposed to be met by requiring the wealthier parishes to "rate in aid." But this provision had never been easy to enforce, and in 1865 the Union Chargeability Act made the Poor Law Union instead of the parish the bearer of the poor rate.

Perhaps the most significant changes during the second half of the nineteenth century center around the development of specialized care for various groups of needy people —sick, children, aged and infirm, insane, feeble-minded, blind, etc. The Webbs point out that "this supplementary policy was avowedly based, not on the principle of a minimum of relief of destitution with deterrent conditions, but on that of supplying whatever was necessary for adequate training or treatment, without objecting to the incidental result that this meant placing out in the competitive world the persons thus dealt with in a position of positive advantage as compared with the lowest class of independent labourers, who plainly could get no such training or treatment."

For dependent children there were provided "district schools," and foster homes. The first district schools were little more than enormous orphanages, but the system of

"boarding-out" which was developed by the Local Government Board was much like the programs of the best child-placing agencies of the present day.

For the sick there were established hospitals, dispensaries, asylums and infirmaries. As early as 1853 the Poor Law Board considered that the qualifications of its medical officers "ought to be such as to ensure for the poor a degree of skill in their medical attendants equal to that which can be commanded by the more fortunate classes of the community."

More and more the insane and feeble-minded were gathered into specialized institutions where they might receive the kind of care and treatment they particularly needed. The blind and the deaf were afforded opportunities for an education in special schools. Thus the work-houses, which in the first half of the century were "catch-alls," came to be chiefly homes for the aged and infirm.

By the time of the 1909 report of the Royal Commission on the Poor Law there had been a pretty complete shift from the position of 1834. The principles of national uniformity, less eligibility and the workhouse test had all been practically discarded except in the case of "wayfarers and vagrants." For these, relief was offered only in "casual wards" where food and accommodations were distinctly inferior to those in the rest of the work-house, and where there was, moreover, compulsory detention and a task of disagreeable and monotonous labor.

In place of the discarded principles there had appeared three which were practically unknown in 1834. The first was that of curative treatment or rehabilitation, that is, actually bringing about physical, mental or moral improvement. This was unquestionably influenced by the humanitarian movements of which we have already spoken,

particularly by charity organization. But behind and impelling both the public and the private agencies was the growth of democracy and of modern science.

The second principle which had been emerging during the latter part of the nineteenth century is described by some as the "principle of universal provision." By this is meant that the government is more and more doing certain things for the whole body of citizens without reference to destitution. Most immediately affecting the Poor Law have been the development of education, sanitation, vaccination, public hospitals, parks, museums, etc. These are offered to all who care to make use of them, regardless of their economic or social status. Again we feel the influence of the growth of democracy.

Third is the principle of compulsion, that is, treating the individual in the way that the community deems best, with relative disregard of his opinion and feeling in the matter. This is apparent in the restraint of vagrants in the casual wards, the compulsory detention of able-bodied men in work-houses under certain conditions, isolation of the "mentally unsound," and of persons with infectious diseases, removal of children from unfit parents, compulsory vaccination, regulation of child labor and compulsory schooling. This is, on the surface, an arbitrariness which seems not to comport with our ideas of democracy. But it has in mind the welfare of the individual immediately concerned only a little less than that of the community as a whole. It is entirely in harmony with a democracy which stands for "the greatest good of the greatest number."

The contrast between 1834 and 1907 is so well stated by Mr. and Mrs. Webb that we quote from their "English Poor Law Policy."

"The 'principles of 1834' plainly embody the doctrine of *laisser faire*. They assume the non-responsibility of

the community for anything beyond keeping the destitute applicant alive. They rely, for inducing the individual to support himself independently, on the pressure that results from his being, in the competitive struggle, simply 'let alone.' As the only alternative to self-support, there is to be presented to him, uniformly throughout the country, the undeviating regimen of the work-house, with conditions 'less eligible' than those of the lowest grade of independent labourer.

"The 'principles of 1907' embody the doctrine of a mutual obligation between the individual and the community. The universal maintenance of a definite minimum of civilized life—seen to be in the interest of the community no less than that of the individual—becomes the joint responsibility of an indissoluble partnership. The community recognizes a duty in the curative treatment of all who are in need of it; a duty most clearly seen in the medical treatment of the sick and the education of the children. Once this corporate responsibility is accepted, it becomes a question whether the universal provision of any necessary common service is not the most advantageous method of fulfilling such responsibility."

SUGGESTED READINGS

Aschrott, Paul: *The English Poor Law System, Past and Present.* Translated from the German by H. P. Thomas. London, 1888.

Leonard, E. M.: *The Early History of English Poor Relief.* Cambridge, 1900.

Gray, B. Kirkman: *A History of English Philanthropy from the Dissolution of the Monasteries to the Taking of the First Census.* London: P. S. King, 1905.

Nicholls, Sir George: *A History of the English Poor Law,* in connection with the legislation and other circumstances affecting the condition of the people. London, 1854, 2 vols.

Mackay, Thomas: *A History of the English Poor Law.* London, 1899. A continuation of Nicholls' two-volume work.

Ruggles, Thomas. *History of the Poor;* Their Rights, Duties and the Laws Respecting Them. London, 1797.

Report of the Commissioners for Inquiring into the Administration and Practical Operation of the Poor Laws, 1834. London: Darling & Son, 1905.

Webb, Sidney and Beatrice: *English Poor Law Policy.* London: Longmans Green, 1910.

Bosanquet, Helen D.: *The Poor Law Report of 1909: a Summary.* London: Macmillan, 1909.

Minority Report of the Poor Law Commission. Edited with Introduction by Sidney and Beatrice Webb. London: Longmans Green, 1909. 2 vols.

Ministry of Health. First Annual Report, 1919–1920, Part III. Administration of the Poor Law, Unemployed Workman Act, Old Age Pensions Acts.

CHAPTER XII

TRANSCENDING THE POOR LAW

THE high points in the development of a public policy toward the problems of poverty in England are 1601, 1834 and 1909. The first date marks the culmination of the Elizabethan efforts to fix responsibility for the poor upon the various local communities. The law of 1834 concentrated the authority in the hands of a National Department. The early years of the twentieth century saw the introduction of two important measures which go far beyond mere poor relief. By these, were established a system of old age pensions and national insurance against sickness, invalidity and unemployment.

The Poor Law had never succeeded in solving the problems of poverty. It was always breaking down at some point or other. But this fact alone did not give rise to the changes which have been made from time to time. Back of the first Poor Law lay the breaking up of feudalism and the gild system, the Protestant Reformation and the rise of Nationalism. Between that and the reforms of 1834 came still further strengthening of the central government, the Napoleonic Wars, and the Industrial Revolution. In the nineteenth century came the tremendous growth of cities and the Democratic Movement.

THE DEMOCRATIC MOVEMENT

The Democratic Movement of the nineteenth century inherited from the French Revolution its slogan "liberty, equality and fraternity." In spite of the repressive measures adopted by England, as well as by the more

reactionary monarchies on the Continent, these ideas made steady gain and presently took tangible form both in the political and economic fields. In politics this movement was heartily espoused by the commercial and industrial bourgeoisie. These new "captains of industry" were seeking privileges for themselves in opposition to the older classes, the nobility and the clergy. Moreover, they were willing to share political privileges so long as their economic position was not hurt. Therefore, we find them standing strongly behind the movements to extend the franchise, which resulted finally in giving practically every Britisher the ballot.

But in the economic field, the democratic movement was characterized chiefly by a struggle of the proletariat, the new working class, not only against the nobility and the clergy, but primarily against the new bourgeoisie. Those phases of the movement for industrial democracy which are usually called socialism or trade unionism we have already discussed briefly in preceding chapters.

The number of persons who call themselves socialists has never been very large in England, but the influence of these people and of their spiritual kinsmen in other groups has been very great. The Association of All Classes and All Nations, the Christian Socialists, the Communist League, the Social Democratic Federation and the Fabian Society, all have made their contributions to this effort to secure economic justice.

The trade unions, in spite of vigorous opposition throughout the past century, have won a much larger following, until to-day an overwhelming majority of English wage-earners are members of some union or other. Through the Independent Labour Party, the Labour Representative Committee and now the Labour Party, these folk have been able to exert a powerful influence upon

legislation, even though their representatives constitute a relatively small group in Parliament.

In response to the democratic urge, there had grown up branches of the national and local governments which provided various services for the general population, services which, moreover, definitely overlapped the work of the Poor Law Authority. Among these were the Education Authority, Health Authority, Lunacy Authority, Unemployment Authority and Pension Authority. Their existence suggested to many liberal-minded folk the possibility of dispensing entirely with the Poor Law. All along, the trade unionists, and still more the socialists, had been calling for fundamental reforms which they believed would make both the public relief system and the private charities unnecessary.

THE POOR LAW REPORT OF 1909

It was in large part the influence of these liberal groups that brought about the appointment in 1905 of a Royal Commission on the Poor Laws and Unemployed. Other forces which contributed to the demand for an investigation of the Poor Law were the ideas of business efficiency which had developed in commerce and industry, and the methods of case work developed by the charity organization societies. Whatever the relative influence of these various factors, a commission of eighteen members was appointed and spent between three and four years assembling evidence and drawing up its conclusions.

There were really two reports published by this Commission, one, the official majority report, and another presented by a dissenting minority. The majority represented the charity organization viewpoint and sought to "widen, strengthen and humanise the Poor Law." The minority report, which was signed by a member of the

Trade Union Congress, a member of the Independent Labour Party, the chairman of the Central Unemployed Body and a member of the Fabian Society, had as its slogans, "Break Up the Poor Law" and "Abolish the Work-house." The commission, however, agreed with remarkable unanimity upon the failure of the existing Poor Law and the necessity for something new. The members united in condemning the Work-house, the Union and the Board of Guardians as a system. They admitted that the existing relief administration was pauperizing, and that it encouraged low wages, under-employment and "sweated" industries.

Primarily the majority report was devoted to the relief system as such, and its purpose as expressed by Mrs. Bosanquet was "to substitute a vital and organic system of combined voluntary and public assistance for the mechanical routine of the Poor Law on the one hand, and the confused chaos of charity on the other." It recommended, therefore, a reorganization under what it proposed to call the Public Assistance Authority, subject to the general control and supervision of the Local Government Board. The local committees were to be appointed by the county councils, "after appointment acting independently." Correlated with them were to be Voluntary Aid Committees, each of which was to be "a recognized link between public assistance and charity." It was intended that "hopeful cases" should be dealt with by the private agencies, leaving "State action for that section of the community which needed the bridle, the curb and the spurs to be disciplined."

The minority felt that "What is proposed by the majority, in substitution for the relief afforded by the Distress Committees of the Unemployed, and for the meals supplied to the hungry children by the Education Authori-

ties, as well as for the work of the Boards of Guardians, is, for all the novel terminology, essentially the present Poor Law under non-elective administration." Indeed, it looks to the outsider as though the majority was seeking to glorify charity and to place the public welfare work under the control of established private philanthropic agencies.

At the same time, it is significant that in their discussions and recommendations, the majority recognized that relief giving alone was inadequate. Therefore, they proceeded to recommend, as means of reducing unemployment, labor bureaus, unemployment insurance, conscious efforts to decasualize labor, and compulsory school attendance. To meet the needs created by sickness and invalidity, they recommended a form of health insurance. These compulsory insurance schemes were opposed by the minority "in view of its probable adverse effect on Trade Union membership and organization."

The main issue between the two groups of commissioners is thus put by Professor Bosanquet, one of the ablest advocates of the majority position:

"The antagonism cannot be put too strongly. The Majority proceed upon the principle that where there is a failure of social self-maintenance in the sense above defined, there is a defect in the citizen character, or at least a grave danger to its integrity; and that, therefore, every case of this kind raises a problem which is 'moral' in the sense of affecting the whole capacity of self-management, to begin with in the person who has failed, and secondarily in the whole community so far as influenced by expectation and example."

On which the Webbs, leaders of the minority group, comment as follows:

"We have first the suggestion that, in all cases of

persons who need maintenance at the hands of the state, there is, as a matter of fact, a moral defect, common to the whole class and requiring specific treatment. Secondly, we see creeping out from behind this suggestion a further assumption as to the policy which ought to be pursued by the Poor Law Authority. This authority, which is to have in its charge all the heterogeneous population of infants, children, sick and mentally defective persons, the aged and infirm, the widows, the vagrants and the unemployed, is to treat them, not with a single eye to what is best calculated to turn them, or any of them into efficient citizens, not even with a single eye to what will most successfully remedy the 'moral defect' which they are assumed all to possess, but with the quite different object or warning off or deterring 'by expectation and example,' other persons from applying for like treatment."

The principle underlying the recommendations of the minority is thus set forth in its report:

"When a Destitution Authority departs from the simple function of providing bare maintenance under deterrent conditions, it finds it quite impossible to mark off or delimit its services from those which are required by and provided for, the population at large. The function of preventing and treating disease among destitute persons cannot in practise, be distinguished from the prevention and treatment of disease in other persons. The rearing of infants and the education of children whose parents are destitute does not differ from the rearing of infants and the education of children whose parents are not destitute. The liability of persons to be compulsorily removed from their homes, because they have become a public nuisance or a source of danger, must surely be the same whether or not they are technically 'destitute.' . . . . . What is demanded by the conditions is not a division according to

the presence or absence of destitution, but a division according to the services to be provided."

The distinctive recommendations of the minority report were that practically all the Poor Laws, including the Settlement Acts, be repealed, that the Boards of Guardians be abolished and their duties, property, etc., be transferred to the County Councils. They proposed that provision for children of school age be assumed by the Education Committee; provision for the sick and permanently incapacitated, infants under school age, and aged needing institutional care by the Health Committee; provision for the mentally defective of all grades and ages by the Asylums Committee; the aged to whom pensions are awarded by the Pension Committee. In order to correlate the efforts which might be expended on behalf of a single family, they urged the creation of the office of Registrar of Public Assistance.

To meet the needs of the able-bodied, the minority report recommended the establishment of a Ministry of Labour to include six divisions: National Labour Exchange, Trade Insurance Division, Maintenance and Training Division, Industrial Regulation Division, Emigration and Immigration Division and Statistical Division. They urged further restriction of child labor, and the requirement that young people under eighteen should attend trade schools a certain portion of each week. In order to help regularize the national demand for labor, they recommended the planning of public work on the basis of a ten years' program, so that in lean years the government might absorb the surplus labor, without having to provide "busy work." For the ultimate residuum of men out of employment, they proposed labor colonies both voluntary and compulsory like those already established on the Continent. This meant a serious effort

to get away from the stigma of charity and pauperism and put all, rich and poor, so far as possible on the same basis before the law. Nevertheless, even the minority saw that the measures proposed would not likely eliminate the need of relief. Therefore, they proposed that there should be certain provision for care in their homes of widows with children, and a limited number of other needy folk.

OLD AGE PENSIONS

As we noted before, the important feature of these 1909 reports is their common recognition of the inadequacy and the undemocratic nature of charity, and their effort to provide something that would strike closer to the roots of poverty and minimize the necessity for relief.

During the course of the investigation and a year before the report was made public, there was established a system of Old Age Pensions. In this, England apparently was influenced by the Danish pension system, and by the German and French old age insurance acts. Under the Act of 1908, nearly all persons over seventy years of age are entitled to a pension of five shillings a week, or a smaller amount if less is needed to bring the total income up to thirteen shillings. There are certain qualifications for the recipient of a pension. He must have resided in Great Britain for twenty-five years and be a citizen. The serving of a prison sentence, or indulgence in habitual inebriety may disqualify him for a period of ten years. On the economic side, he must be poor, but must not have been a pauper.

In spite of the very high age limit, and other restrictions, the number of pensions was 667,000 in the first year, and by 1912 practically seventy-five per cent. of the

population over seventy years of age was receiving old age pensions.

There has been a feeling on the part of some that the prospect of an old age pension would decrease habits of thrift, would exercise a disintegrating effect on family life, depress wages, and would impose an enormous cost upon the nation. The experience of England does not seem to have substantiated the first three fears, and the significance of the reality of the fourth is not that the pensions are objectionable, but that the extent of old age distress and the need for support is much greater than most people are willing to believe. Whatever arguments may be sustained in regard to the undemocratic character of the old age pensions, it is clear that they are much more dignified, business-like, and conducive to self-respect, than is the usual charity. The amount of the pension is admittedly too small, but in so far as it does suffice, it has the advantage over poor relief that it does not wait until the aged person is reduced to abject poverty.

THE NATIONAL INSURANCE ACT

In 1911, two years after the reports of the Poor Law Commission, there was passed the National Insurance Act, providing against sickness, invalidity and unemployment. Like the Old Age Pension Law, this was influenced largely by similar schemes already adopted in other countries. In fact, Germany had initiated a national compulsory system of health insurance as early as 1883, and unemployment insurance had been introduced on a voluntary basis in 1905 by France and Norway.

The British Act of 1911 requires that all manual laborers between sixteen and seventy years of age, and all other employed persons with an annual income of less than one hundred and sixty pounds, carry health insurance. Voluntary insurance is open to persons not covered by

the compulsory system, whose earned income is less than one hundred and sixty pounds. The benefits granted by the Act are a cash benefit for disability, medical aid, a maternity benefit both in money and in obstetrical aid, and a funeral benefit. The maternity benefit, it should be stated, applies both to insured women and the wives of insured men.

The cost is divided among employers, employes and the state, according to a sliding scale which adjusts the distribution of the premium according to sex and rate of wage. Technically, the British system imposes the compulsion to insurance, but leaves the choice of carrier to the individual insured person. The local administration is in the hands of so-called Insurance Committees, which consist of representatives of the insured, of the Physicians and also of the local council and general administration.

The insurance against unemployment was at first much more limited in its scope. It was compulsory only in a limited number of trades representing construction and engineering. It was planned to include not more than one-fifth of the wage earners of Great Britain. As in the case of the health insurance, the expense is divided among employers, employes and the state. But instead of allowing options as to the carrier, there is a single national unemployment fund, into which all dues flow, and from which all benefits are paid.

As we have repeatedly insisted, the old age pensions and social insurance are of importance in the history of social work, because they have developed as protests against poor relief; against its insufficiency, against its degrading character, and against its social injustice. The ideal purpose of social insurance is to prevent, and finally to eradicate poverty and the consequent need of relief by

meeting the problem at its origin rather than waiting until the effects of destitution have begun to be felt.

We have long been accustomed to protect ourselves against one source of poverty by carrying fire insurance. By this means, we meet in a business-like fashion the calamities, which, in a country like Russia, give rise to an enormous amount of suffering. Similarly, we have developed commercial schemes of life insurance which, so far as they can, prevent widows and orphans from suddenly becoming destitute upon the death of a husband and father.

Of course, fire insurance and life insurance do not by themselves prevent fire or death, although the efforts of the best companies are directed along preventive lines. But, at least, they do prevent much poverty which would otherwise arise from these incidents. Similarly, it is pointed out by the Webbs that social insurance alone will not prevent sickness, accidents and unemployment; that it will provide, after all, not a radical cure but primarily a treatment of symptoms. Nevertheless, accident insurance has greatly stimulated the invention and employment of preventive measures, and so has had a real influence in reducing the number of casualties. And there seems no reason to doubt that the newer forms of insurance will operate in a similar direction.

We have now traced the development of the English Poor Law from its beginnings in the repression of begging, the regulation of individual alms, and the fixing of public responsibility upon local communities, through the development of a national system of relief, to the recent efforts to supplant charity by such measures as those we have just been discussing. We have seen the development in England of a technique for organizing and administering aid to the poor. We have followed the rise of

national responsibility for the problems of poverty. Finally, we have recognized a growing consciousness of the inadequacy, if not the futility, of all charity.

SUGGESTED READINGS

Reports of the Royal Commission on the Poor Laws and Unemployment. 3 vols. London: Wyman & Sons, 1909.

House of Commons Session Papers of 1909. Vol. 37.

Bosanquet, Helen D.: *The Poor Law Report of 1909.* London: Macmillan, 1909.

Webb, Sidney and Beatrice: *English Poor Law Policy.* London: Longmans Green, 1910.

Ministry of Health. First Annual Report, 1919–1920. Part III. Administration of the Poor Law, Unemployed Workman Act, Old Age Pensions Acts.

Chance, Sir Wm.: *Poor Law Reform. The Case for the Guardians.* London: P. S. King, 1910.

Muirhead, John H.: *By What Authority?* The principles in common and at issue in the reports of the poor law commission. London: P. S. King, 1909.

Lubbock, Gertrude: *Some Poor Relief Questions;* with the arguments on both sides, together with the summary of the reports of the Royal Commission on the Aged Poor. London: Murray, 1895.

Sutherland, W.: *Old Age Pensions.* London: Methuen, 1907.

Hoare, Henry J.: *Old Age Pensions;* their actual working and ascertained results in the United Kingdom. London: King, 1915.

Hoffman, F. L.: *Methods and Results of National Health Insurance in Great Britain.* Nat. Civic Fed., 1920.

Halsey, Olga S., and Lasker, Bruno: *The British System of Unemployment Insurance.* U. S. Bur. Lab. Stat. Bul. No. 212, 1917.

Alden, Percy: *Democratic England.* New York: Macmillan, 1912.

Rose, John H.: *The Rise and Growth of Democracy in Great Britain.*

Hayes, Carlton J. H.: *British Social Politics.* Boston: Ginn, 1913.

PART IV

CHAPTER XIII

THE RELIGIOUS MERIT OF ALMSGIVING

To the present point we have, in addition to describing what seem to be the outstanding features of present-day social work, studied two of its forebears: nineteenth century humanitarianism and the English Poor Law. Back of these lie the ecclesiastical charities of the middle ages and the mutual aid of medieval communities. When we have examined all four, we shall have accounted in a general way for the rise of social work as a profession, with its numerous but more or less correlated remedial, preventive and constructive agencies.

Each of these developments has brought a real contribution of permanent value even though it might be bound up with some very undesirable features. The great contribution of the nineteenth century humanitarians was the doctrine of "business efficiency." The English, in working out their Poor Law, achieved the ideas of national responsibility for the problems of poverty and of the inadequacy of all charity. The Church, as we shall presently see, stimulated and cultivated a spirit of helpfulness to all men, which first manifested itself in forms devised for the mutual assistance of the members of simple neighborhood groups.

RISE OF THE DOCTRINE

The charities of the Christian Church rested so largely on the doctrine of the religious merit of almsgiving that it is worth our while to examine this in some detail.

Just when this doctrine first appeared is hard to say, but there is pretty clear evidence of its existence among the Hebrew people long before the founding of Christianity.

OLD TESTAMENT ORIGINS

One of the earliest suggestions of the idea that religious merit is to be obtained through rendering assistance to the needy appears in the Mosaic Law. "At the end of every three years thou shalt bring forth all the tithe of thine increase in the same year, and shalt lay it up within thy gates: and the Levite, because he hath no portion nor inheritance with thee, and the sojourner, and the fatherless, and the widow, that are within thy gates, shall come and shall eat and be satisfied; that Jehovah thy God may bless thee in all the work of thy hand which thou doest." (Deut. xiv: 28–29.) However, the rewards here suggested appear to have no reference to another life after death.

It has been suggested that the formulation of the doctrine of the religious merit of almsgiving occurred during the Babylonian captivity, when some of the Jews were currying the favor of their masters for the sake of personal advantage. Then it was that their leaders appealed to them to be loyal to their own people, in spite of temporal discomfort, because of the religious benefits involved. However this may have been, we do find through the Old Testament many intimations that one might "break off his iniquities" by "showing mercy to the poor."

After the establishment of the Christian Church, and especially after its recognition by Constantine, this idea began to assume prominence. Then the church fathers went back and gathered up excerpts from the Bible and

read into them, very likely, many things which they did not originally signify.

NEW TESTAMENT TEACHINGS

They found in the New Testament as well as the Old many verses which taught this doctrine, or into which it could be read. Some of the best known passages are these: "And whosoever shall give to drink unto one of these little ones a cup of cold water only, in the name of a disciple, verily I say unto you, he shall in no wise lose his reward." (Matt. x: 42.) "But when thou makest a feast, bid the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind: and thou shalt be blessed; because they have not wherewith to recompense thee; for thou shalt be recompensed in the resurrection of the just." (Luke xiv: 13–14.) See also Jesus' description of the Day of Judgment (Matt. xxv: 31–46) and the story of Zaccheus (Mark x: 17–22).

TEACHINGS OF THE CHURCH FATHERS

The idea that the giving of alms constituted a sacrifice in the sense of a religious ceremony seems first to have appeared in the teachings of the church fathers. Thus Cyprian said, "He who will at the Day of Judgment reward alms and good works listens more graciously even today to a prayer if it is accompanied by alms." This same notion was expressed by Origen in these words: "Happy is he who fasts for the purpose of feeding the poor." The Apostolic Constitutions also gave the express injunction: "If anyone has nothing to give, let him fast and apply the day's share to the saints."

Referring to the association of almsgiving with fasting, Uhlhorn says: "However admirable may be the strength of the love which thus imposed sacrifices on itself that it might be able to give to others, we must

not on the other hand ignore the fact that this combination of almsgiving and fasting already announced a corruption of almsgiving by secondary motives of an ascetic character. Emphasis was at least laid on the renunciation therein shown, as well as on the love of the brethren. And it was just this notion that there was some independent moral value in self-deprivation of a portion of earthly possessions which became, as we shall see, extremely dangerous to charity; nay, destroyed its inmost core."

So long as the Church was small and members for the most part acquainted with one another, there was little need for formal relief work. But with the increase in numbers, and especially with the increase in wealth, after the recognition of Christianity by Constantine, the church fathers found it more and more necessary to present the claims of the needy. One of the most ardent advocates of almsgiving was Chrysostom, who was Archbishop of Constantinople in the fourth century. In one of his homilies, we find these words: "With whatsoever sins then thou mayest be burdened, thy charity outweighs them all." And in another homily, the following significant passage appears: "To-day begins a trade in alms, for we see the prisoners and the poor; we see those who wander about the market; we hear how they cry, and weep, and mourn; we have a wonderful fair before our eyes." At a fair, however, there is but one object; the man of business has no other aim than to buy goods cheaply and to sell them dearly. Such a fair has God opened to us: "Buy the works of righteousness cheaply, to realize in the future a higher price, if indeed it is allowable to call requital realization. Here righteousness is sold cheap, sold for an insignificant piece of bread, for a miserable garment, for a cup of cold water. As long as the market lasts, let us buy alms, or rather let us purchase salvation through alms."

In his homilies on St. John and the Hebrews, Chrysostom outlined five ways of absolution of sins: (1) confession, (2) forgiveness of others, (3) almsgiving, (4) prayers, (5) fasting. "Let us then use every means to wipe off filthiness. But first, the font cleanseth, then other ways also, many and of all kinds. For God being merciful hath even after this given us various means of reconciliation, of all which the first is that by almsdoing. 'By almsdeeds,' it saith, 'and deeds of faith sins are cleansed away.' By almsdoing, I *do not mean* that which is maintained by *injustice,* for this is not almsdoing, but savageness and inhumanity. What profits it to strip one man and clothe another? For we ought to begin action with mercy, but this is inhumanity. If we give away everything that we have got from other people, it is *no gain to us.* And this Zaccheus shows, who on that occasion said that he propitiated God by giving four times as much as he had taken. (Luke xix: 8.) But we, when we plunder unboundedly, and give but little, think that we make God propitious, whereas we do rather *exasperate Him.* For tell me if thou shouldst drag a dead and rotten ass from waysides and lanes and bring it to the altar would not all stone thee as accursed and polluted? Well then, if I prove that a sacrifice polluted by plunder is more polluted than this, what defense shall we obtain? . . . . . And dost thou in words entreat God to forget thy misdeeds, and doest thou by what thou thyself doest, robbing and grasping, and placing thy sin upon altar, cause him to remember them continually? . . . . . 'No,' saith one, 'not the same money, but other.' Mockery this, and trifling. Knowest thou not that if one drop of injustice fall on a great quantity of wealth, the whole is defiled? . . . . . First get free from rapine, and then show forth

almsdeeds. . . . . Now if he who brought too little *angered God,* when one gives what is another's, how shall he not anger Him?"

PAPAL INDULGENCES

Perhaps the clearest expression of the doctrine of the religious merit of almsgiving is to be found in the indulgences authorized by the popes and church councils. Thus the Council of Ravenna, in 1286, accorded a year of indulgences to bishops who served four indigents a meal on each day of the week; to abbots who received two; and to other prelates, deacons and archdeacons who performed the same service for at least one unfortunate person. The form of a papal brief of 1392 was as follows:

"Relaxation of seven years and seven quadragene to penitents who on the principal feasts of the year and those of St. James in the month of July and the dedication, the usual octaves and six days; and of a hundred days to those who during the said octaves and days visit and give alms for the sustentation and recreation of the chapel of St. James' poor hospital without the walls, London."

William, Lord Berkeley directed the executors of his will in 1492:

"to purchase a pardon from the court of Rome, as large as may be had, for this Chapple (Longbridge), from evensonge to evensonge, in the feast of Trinity for ever, for pleyne remission to them that will be confessed and contrite."

Hospital proctors practically became peddlars of divine favor, selling the forgiveness of sins for donations to their respective institutions. Thus those who bought pardon from the proctor of St. James at Canterbury were informed that the benefit of thirty thousand Paternosters and Ave Marias were freely imparted to them.

This doctrine, valuable though it unquestionably was as a means of stimulating a spirit of self-sacrifice and of helpfulness, nevertheless, seems very frequently to have degenerated into what was essentially a commercial proposition. There were, on the one hand, professional almsgivers. Very often, neither they nor the original donors appear to have been very much interested in the effects of their alms on the recipients. They seem to have been chiefly concerned about the profits in the form of the salvation of their souls. On the other hand, there grew up a profession of begging. The asking of alms was the beggars' means of getting a living. Their business was asking alms and praying for the souls of the givers. But it must have been little indeed that they cared about the donors' salvation. What they wanted was to get all they could out of them. How similar to the ordinary business transaction of to-day!

It is quite possible to overdo this materialistic interpretation. The Church with its doctrine of the religious merit of almsgiving had provided a form which practically all charity had to take. Even a man who put himself fairly completely into the place of the beggar would very likely, nay quite certainly, make his gift in the established form. So, it is conceivable that a man might have a genuine sympathy for the beggars, but offer his assistance in the stereotyped manner laid down by ecclesiastical dogma and common practice.

INFLUENCE OF THE DOCTRINE

INDIVIDUAL ALMSGIVING

The influence of this preaching by the Church will appear more clearly if we examine some specific instances of individual almsgiving. Aside from the dropping of

money in the box at church and payments to collectors who might come to the house, the most common forms of individual alms were the endowment of hospitals and the provision for distribution of food or clothing at one's funeral service and its anniversaries.

As an example of the former, we find that in 1375 Barthelomeus Boudart restored Vaucouleurs, an institution destroyed by the enemy. He did this in a spirit of piety and anxiety for the salvation of his soul: "pietate motus, ac suae salutis non immemor." A citizen of Pistoja expressed the same thought in his last will and testament, in 1330. "The said testator leaves of his goods for the healing and saving of his soul and those of his parents a thousand and seventy Florentine denarii" for a hospital which he goes on to describe. An English statute of 1414 speaks of "many hospitals founded as well by the noble kings of this realm, and lords and ladies, both spiritual and temporal, as well as by others of divers estates, to the honor of God and of His glorious Mother in aid and merit of the souls of the said founders."

In Paris, Denis de Mauroy, procurer-general, expressed himself thus: (1411) "I will that from the day of my death until eight days thereafter there be distributed daily three alms for God in honor of the blessed Trinity of Paradise, to three poor people, furnishing to each one a pint of wine, a three-gram loaf of bread and a little white wine, and that they be charged to pray God for me and for my said company."

Sir John Fastolf, whose will is dated 1459, established, "within the great mansion at Castre by him lately edified, a college of vi religious men, monks or secular priests, and vi poor folk," for purposes which were essentially those of a chantry,—"to pray for his soul, and the souls of his wife, his father and mother and others that he was

beholden to in perpetuity." Many a testator would have echoed the request of Fastolf that his goods might be so faithfully distributed in "almsful deeds and charitable works" that he might obtain "the more hasty deliverance of his soul from the painful flames of Purgatory." A testator at Bury, in 1463, thought it worth while to mention that he would "no common dole have;" what he desired was that every poor man and woman should have a penny, and two children a penny, but only on condition that they were present at his solemn dirge, "to pray for" him, and this "at the discretion of his executors."

Matthew Ernest, of London, in 1506, provided that the church wardens of the parish of St. Dunstan should on every Saturday give a penny apiece to five poor people, alternately men and women. At the same time, the recipients were to be enjoined to pray for the soul of their benefactors. The same motive is clearly expressed by Henry de Blois, bishop of Winchester, in his reference to a hospital, "which I for the health of my soul and the souls of my predecessors and of the kings of England have founded."

The devotion of Queen Maud to the service of the lepers, about 1100, is of particular interest in this connection. Aelred of Rievaulx relates how Prince David visited her and found the house full of lepers, in the midst of whom stood the queen. She washed, dried and even kissed their feet, telling her brother that in so doing she was kissing the feet of the Eternal King. When she begged him to follow her example, he withdrew smiling, afterwards confessing to Aelred:—"I was sore afraid and answered that I could on no account endure it, for as yet I did not know the Lord, nor had His spirit been revealed to me."

Of Walter de Lucy, the chronicler of Battle Abbey writes:—

"He especially compassionated the forlorn condition of those afflicted with leprosy and elephantiasis, whom he was so far from shunning, that he frequently waited upon them in person, washing their hands and feet, and, with the utmost cordiality, imprinting upon them the soothing kisses of love and piety."

In the cases just cited, it is the practise of washing and kissing the feet of pilgrims and lepers and the conspicuous type of self-deprivation that indicate where the interest was centered. The fact that these things, rather than the rehabilitation of needy families, were recorded and approved shows how thoroughly medieval philanthropy was permeated with the idea that religious merit is acquired through alms. It is also only fair to add that the instances to which we have referred are typical of thousands of records to which any student of history has ready access.

EFFECTS OF THE DOCTRINE

ENCOURAGEMENT OF BEGGING AND IDLENESS

With this continued emphasis upon the spiritual welfare of the givers, it was inevitable that the particular need of the recipients should often be overlooked. Consequently, there not only was failure to provide the things most needed, but there was encouragement of begging and idleness. This is clearly indicated by Fuller in his "Church History" in the paragraph which we quoted in a previous chapter.[1]

The shortcomings of indiscriminate almsgiving are recognized by the Catholic historians as well as by the

[1] See page 177

Protestants and those without special interest in the Church. Thus Lallemand says, "We cannot deceive ourselves. These liberalities necessitated by the misfortunes of the times favored idleness." Again, "These largesses, these general alms, these allowances, which followed funerals without possible distinction between the real poor and the incorrigibly idle, gave rise to many abuses."

The same admission is made by another Catholic historian, Georg Ratzinger. His conclusions are summarized by Ashley in the following words: "In the fifteenth century, and too often in the fourteenth, the monks yielded to idleness and luxury, and love for the poor grew cold; the careful investigation and relief of distress among the laboring population of the neighborhood was given up; and nothing remained but indiscriminate almsgiving at the convent gate. And Ratzinger points out that even with the best intentions, the distribution of alms at a number of centres scattered very unevenly over the country, and without any system of joint action, could not but be inadequate and hurtful. 'The monasteries, hospitals, etc., were without what is the first requisite for an orderly relief of the poor—unity, concentration, organization. Every hospital, each convent gave alms, not only to the people of the district, but also to all strangers who chose to apply, without having any power of control over them;' and he adds, as the natural consequence, that 'professional beggary, even with the harshest laws, could not be overcome.'"

If further evidence were needed of the utter failure of the charities of the medieval church to solve the problems of poverty, it could be found in the dozens of laws passed in every European country for the repression of begging. Some of these we have already cited in our study of the English Poor Law. Surely, the nations of western

Europe would not have resorted to whipping, branding, galleys, deportation and even slavery and death, as punishments for begging, unless this had been a very serious evil.

IGNORING OF FUNDAMENTAL PROBLEMS

But an even more serious effect of the philanthropy which was based on the religious merit of almsgiving was the ignoring of fundamental social problems. From the very beginning of the Christian Church, there was an acceptance of the established order. This was doubtless due to the hope for an early return of the Lord and a feeling that injustice in this world mattered little because it would so soon be rectified in the next. Therefore, the Church did not undertake to destroy the institution of human slavery. It advised the slaves instead of caring for freedom, rather to make good use of their calling as slaves. Indeed, the Church itself became in the fourth and fifth centuries the owner of a large number of slaves. From the passing of the Apostles to the end of the Crusades the expectation of an early return of the Lord was gradually given up, but the notion that the social order was subject to change did not enter men's minds for many centuries. The unequal distribution of property, the social distinctions between rich and poor, the subjection of women, and other injustices which have by no means entirely vanished, were long accepted as a matter of course, and no efforts were put forth for their elimination.

For further evidence that the teachings of the Church meant the ignoring of certain fundamental problems and, indirectly at least, obstructed social justice, we quote the following passage from Lallemand, who, it should be remembered, takes the orthodox Catholic position that

all charity is a function of the Church alone, and should be administered in accordance with its teachings.

"It is customary in some circles to quote isolated phrases of St. John Chrysostom, of St. Basil, or other Christian orators of that period, with the following comment: 'See, these men are contemptuous of private property. They are enemies of wealth, democrats stirring up the crowd to take by main force that which is denied them, veritable precursors of our modern socialists.'

"Nothing is farther from the truth. The fathers of the Church take pains to preach resignation and patience to the poor, showing them the future reward that will be theirs if they bear their misfortunes in a Christian manner. They oppose enviousness and revolution, declaring that the rich man is accountable only to God for the use of his wealth. The conclusion of their most passionate sermons on behalf of the oppressed always includes an ardent appeal for charity, not a provocation to spoliation.

"'I have warned the rich,' cries St. Augustine. 'Now it is for you poor people to listen to me. Give, but be wary of taking anything. Stifle covetousness within you. You have the entire world in common with the rich man, but you do not have his house and estate in common with him. You possess in common with him the sun by day to give you light and make your work fruitful. Seek to gain that which should suffice for your nourishment, but beware of demanding more.'"

In such words as these has the church often sought to make the poor contented with their lot, and look to the life after death for the good things which are denied them in this world. Moreover, it seems to have been because of the philosophy back of these words that the Church often has not been the leader in social reform, but has rather

been found on the side of conservatism and reaction. This, of course, has not been universally true, but it has been so generally so that it seems a just characterization of the ecclesiastical position.

AN INCENTIVE TO PHILANTHROPY

The teaching of the religious merit of almsgiving has unquestionably encouraged kindly feeling and sympathy. It assuredly led to the relief of much suffering in a day when everyone lived in a little neighborhood group and regarded all outsiders with suspicion. It provided a technique for the extending of social relations. These were the contributions of this doctrine. But at the same time, it is clear that its application encouraged pauperism and obstructed the solution of fundamental economic and social problems. It seems fair to say that the doctrine of the religious merit of almsgiving has served a valuable purpose in the development of philanthropy, but that its usefulness is long since outworn.

SUGGESTED READINGS

General

Catholic Encyclopedia. New York: Appleton, 1907–1912.

Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1908.

Lea, H. C.: *A History of Auricular Confession and Indulgences in the Latin Church.* Philadelphia, 1896.

Church History

Walker, W.: *A History of the Christian Church.* New York: Scribners, 1918.

Ayer, Jos. C.: *A Source Book for Ancient Church History,* from the apostolic age to the close of the conciliar period. New York: Scribners, 1913.

Canfield, L. H.: *The Early Persecutions of the Christians.* New York: Columbia University, 1913.
Bigg, Chas.: *The Church's Task Under the Roman Empire.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905.
Archer, T. A., and Kingsford, C. L.: *The Crusades;* the story of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem. New York: Putnams, 1895.
Brehier, Louis: *L'Église et l'Orient au Moyen Age: les Croisades.* Paris: Lecoffre, Gabalda, 1907.
Lagarde, André: *The Latin Church in the Middle Ages.* Trans. by Archibald Alexander. New York: Scribners, 1915.
Barry, Wm. F.: *The Papal Monarchy from St. Gregory the Great to Boniface VIII (590–1303).* New York: Putnams, 1902.
Smith, A. L.: *Church and State in the Middle Ages.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.
Ageorges, Joseph: *La Vie et l'Organization du Clergé sous l'ancien Régime.* Paris, 1905.
Baur, F. C.: *Die christliche Kirche des Mittelalters.* Tübingen, 1861.
Fisher, Geo. P.: *The Reformation.* New York, Scribners, 1906.
Lindsay, Thos. M.: *A History of the Reformation.* New York: Scribners, 1906-07.

CHAPTER XIV

DEVELOPMENT OF ECCLESIASTICAL CHARITIES

It would be possible, if we were so inclined, to trace the origins of ecclesiastical charities back to the tithes imposed by the ancient Hebrews before the Babylonian Captivity, but for our purposes it is sufficient to see how mutual aid in the simple groups of early Christians gradually developed into the very elaborate system of ecclesiastical charities which was characteristic of the middle ages.

THE EARLY CHURCH

THE ERA OF PERSECUTIONS

The descriptions which we have of the early Christian Church indicate that it bore very much the character of a big family. The numbers were relatively small, and they were united on the one hand by the enthusiasm of a new-found faith, and on the other by the persecutions from without. The second chapter of the Book of Acts pictures to us the custom of eating together. These common meals were doubtless primarily a religious observance, but being daily participated in they constituted a powerful bond of union among the early Christians.

In still another way was the unity of this simple group manifested. The Church was open to all people of all social classes and all races. Slaves, bondservants, and free Roman citizens were taken in on equal terms. Greeks, Romans and Jews sat down to the love-feasts together. This did not mean, however, that the Church ignored the

existence of social classes. The Epistles of Paul show clearly that the Christians accepted the institution of slavery, and made little if any effort to overthrow it. The position apparently was that this was a thing of the flesh, and it was only spiritual relations that counted. Moreover, they doubtless looked to the world-to-come for the alteration of social and economic inequalities of this world. The belief in the early return of the Lord made this postponement of social justice much easier to endure.

Another bond which held the early Christians together as a simple community was the holding of goods in common. Thus we read in the fourth chapter of Acts that "the multitude of them who believed were of one heart and soul; and not one of them said that aught of the things which he possessed was his own; but they had all things common." However, it seems that communism was not obligatory nor long continued, but it does seem to have had sufficient vogue to help bind the Christians together in a simple family group.

Correlated with the more or less common holding of property was the idea that everyone should support himself, or that each should contribute in proportion to his ability to the support of the group. Thus, we find Paul writing to the Thessalonians: "If any will not work neither let him eat." However, with the growth of the Church, there appear to have been some who were ready to impose upon their neighbors and to take unfair advantage of the community. Paul was doubtless referring to these when he continued in the same Epistle: "For we hear of some that walk among you disorderly, that work not at all, but are busy-bodies. Now them that are such, we command and exhort in the Lord Jesus Christ that in quietness they work and eat their bread."

The persecutions of the first three centuries not only

united the Christians very closely, but also forced the Church to be fairly exclusive. The espionage of the authorities made it positively dangerous to take in the stranger unless he could show credentials. Because of the persecutions, it became necessary for the churches to assist one another in times of special need. The New Testament refers to a number of collections taken for the benefit of the Jerusalem Church.

The first formal action for the care of unfortunate Christians may be indicated in the sixth chapter of Acts: "Now in these days when the number of disciples was multiplying, there arose a murmuring of the Grecian Jews against the Hebrews because their widows were neglected in the daily administration; and the twelve called the multitude of disciples unto them and said: 'It is not fit that we should forsake the Word of God and serve the tables. Look ye out therefore, brethren, from among you seven men of good report, full of the spirit and of wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business.'" This practise of appointing deacons, which was begun in Jerusalem, seems to have spread to all of the churches. It is indicated, moreover, in the letters to Timothy that some women were given a share in relief work and that widows were sometimes employed by the church for this purpose.

The entertainment of strangers is very frequently spoken of in the New Testament, and it is quite natural that much stress should have been laid upon the practise of hospitality, because the church had a strong missionary character, and every member probably regarded it as his duty to spread the Gospel. The command, "Go ye into all the world and teach all nations" was taken quite literally. Hence, it should not astonish us to find much moving from place to place among the Christians of the

earliest times. The hospitality of the Church came after a time to be abused by idlers, as well as by spies. Therefore, it was necessary to take precautions for keeping these undesirable and dangerous persons away. It became customary not to receive a brother unless he could authenticate himself to the church by a letter of introduction.

An important phase of early Christian charity was the visiting of Christians in prisons and ransoming those who were made captives. In the course of the persecutions many of them were condemned to the galleys, to quarries or to mines, where they had to perform very hard labor under exceedingly difficult conditions. The purpose of the visitation was partly to provide for their physical needs, partly to cheer them up, but particularly to encourage them to persevere in Christian faith.

The Agape, or love-feast began, as we have seen, simply as the common meal of a group of people who were sharing their all. After a time the ceremonial aspect of this came to be more emphasized, and it became principally a celebration of the Lord's Supper. At the same time, it was made a means of feeding the poor. But in many of the churches, it seems to have become a fashionable banquet for the bishops and other prominent persons in which the poor had little or nothing to eat.

Some special attention was given to the care of orphans and foundlings, largely no doubt as a humanitarian effort, and partly as a means of saving them to the Church. The bishop was usually responsible for seeing that dependent children were brought up at the expense of the Church. The girls were to be given, when of marriageable age, to Christian husbands, and the boys were supposed to learn some trade and then be provided with tools and placed in a position to earn their own living.

As we have already suggested, the charity of the early Christian Church began simply as a form of mutual aid among the members of a simple group. As their numbers grew the methods of giving relief became more formal. But throughout the era of the persecutions, that is, the first three centuries, relief was practically restricted to members of the Church. Still there are instances of its extension to outsiders. Thus, when there was a pestilence at Carthage, Cyprian preached: "If we only do good to those who do good to us, what do we more than the heathens and publicans? If we are the children of God who makes the sun to shine upon the good and bad and sends rain on the just and the unjust, let us prove it by our actions by blessing those who curse us and doing good to those who persecute us." According to Eusebius, similar aid to outsiders in time of an epidemic occurred at Alexandria and at Rome.

FROM CONSTANTINE TO GREGORY

With the conversion of Constantine, Christianity ceased to be a persecuted religion. The Edict of Milan in 313 granted freedom of religion to all faiths, but in the course of time Christianity became practically the state church. This laid the foundation for later religious wars, and for persecutions *by* the Christians. Thus the democratic principle of Christianity did not come to immediate fruition. Society was divided into Christians and pagans, so far as the ruling view-point was concerned.

The Völkerwanderung, the wars between the Romans and Teutons, meant the overrunning of all of civilized Europe, devastations, confiscation, captivity, poverty and misery of all kinds. The establishment of the Teutonic kingdoms restored a measure of order, but there was a clash of the old mores with the new. Serfdom was

growing very rapidly. The poor sought the protection of the wealthy and strong. The wealthy needed men to work their estates, and retainers to fight the invader. The Church began to hold and to acquire property. It soon owned many estates on which were many church serfs and even slaves. Some of the bishops became very wealthy and haughty. Democratic relations disappeared, not only as between Christians and others, but even within the Church.

During the three hundred years between the recognition of Christianity by Constantine and the development of the Papacy under Gregory, the methods and agencies of relief were survivals of those already described. There was, however, one important innovation; namely, the establishment of the xenodochia. These were institutions for all sorts of persons who needed relief; orphans, widows, the aged, sick, poverty stricken and travellers. They were usually attached to some church, or later to a monastery, and located along a main route of travel. They were made necessary by the increase in the numbers of Christians to a point where neither travellers nor the various needy folk could be taken care of in private homes, however hospitable.

During all this time the power of the Bishops at Rome was increasing and, as Popes, they were able to a certain extent to regulate and standardize the charities of the various churches and religious orders. It was during this period that monasticism developed to a position of importance. St. Benedict, one of its conspicuous founders, belonged to the sixth century. The spirit of this new movement is thus described by Uhlhorn: "Men despaired of pervading the whole mass with the leaven of the gospel, and were contented that there should be individual saints and perfect Christians. The genuinely ancient notion, the

distinction between philosophers and the common people, the aristocratic feature by which ancient ethic is permeated, again found acceptance in Christianity and in entire correspondence with ancient ethics, the contemplative life of the Christian philosophers, of the monks, was esteemed as higher and better than the life of ordinary Christians, living and working in the world."

FROM GREGORY TO CHARLEMAGNE

During the two centuries between the elevation of Gregory to the papacy and the crowning of Charlemagne, feudalism became quite general and made European society a hierarchy of castes. This economic and political development reflected itself in the Church, whose democratic principle was more and more lost sight of.

The mutual aid of the simple neighborhood groups, such as comprised the membership of the early churches, was not organized charity in the exact sense. Neither was the care which the bishops as feudal over-lords, gave to their serfs. Organized charities generally have been called into being by the breakdown of such primary social relationships. Charity, as such, was the aid given to persons who did not have those intimate relations with the donor. It was given primarily to detached individuals.

Now the occasions of detachment were pilgrimages to holy shrines, the running away of serfs, and wars which accompanied the Völkerwanderung, and the rise of Mohammedanism. Other causes of poverty and distress were the frequent famines, due to crop failures, bad winters, and inadequate means of transportation. There were also frequent epidemics caused by insanitary living conditions and lack of medical science.

During these centuries, there was nothing that could properly be called public relief. The Church in its various

aspects was almost the sole agency for the care of the needy. The parish was especially responsible for its own poor. The money was usually obtained from tithes, which were divided into four parts: one each for the bishop, the clergy, the church repairs and the poor. The relief might be administered by distributions from the church, or by care in a xenodochium.

Even more important as an agency of relief was the monastery. Among the rules of some of the monastic orders were a requirement of poverty and devotion to the relief of distress. The monasteries found the source of their distributions in the income from their estates, donations, legacies and collections. Sometimes they gave indiscriminately to all who came to the abbey door; sometimes they carried food to the poor in their homes; and sometimes they provided maintenance in the xenodochium or hospital, as it was frequently called.

As we have already seen, the popes, bishops and lesser clergy gave as individuals for the support of people on indigent lists, and established foundations for institutional care. These lists of the poor, called matricula, were also kept by some of the monasteries and parish churches. They were supposed to show who were eligible for assistance.

Begging had become quite general, in spite of efforts of the Church to discourage it. Sometimes beggars were given permission to beg at church doors. The continued practice of hospitality to pilgrims, the preaching of the religious merit of almsgiving, and the indiscriminate doles from monastery gates were chiefly responsible for encouraging beggary.

Medical relief was usually given in the xenodochia. Some of the nobles retained physicians in their households, but their skill was very limited. Bleeding was a

common practice. The bulk of the populace depended upon magic, sorcery, incantations, talismans, charms and enchanted herbs, or took long pilgrimages to pray at the tombs of the saints for bodily healing.

In western Europe the xenodochium continued as a catch-all. But in the East abundant resources and comparative peace until the rise of Mohammedanism in the seventh century, made it possible to develop separate institutions for the varied groups of needy persons. The xenodochia became institutions chiefly for travellers and strangers without means. In addition, there were institutions known as nosochomia for the care of the sick, brephotrophia for the care of dependent children, and gerontochia for the aged. In the West, this development of specialized institutions was retarded by the invasions and wars of various sorts. However, we have record of a foundling asylum opened by a priest named Dathus, in Milan, in 795, in which infants were to be kept until the age of seven, when they were to be apprenticed.

The results of the indiscriminate charities of this period are thus described by the Catholic historian, Lallemand: "We cannot deceive ourselves. These liberalities necessitated by the misfortunes of the times favored idleness. With meritorious persons there mingled slaves, fugitive clergy, debauched men and enemies of work. In order to make, so far as possible, a sort of selection it was advised to require from those who were unknown a letter of recommendation. The Council of Tours in 567 attempted to remedy these numerous abuses by deciding that each commune should be required to relieve its own inhabitants in order to prevent begging and vagabondage." Lallemand goes on to tell us that the efforts to correct this evil were unsuccessful, and speaking of one of the capitularies of Charlemagne, says: "It is needless to add that

this capitulary obtained no more results than its predecessors. . . . . The ninth century ended in the midst of internal wars and Norman invasions. Christian charity overrun could do no more than apply palliatives to such a state of things."

THE MIDDLE AGES

The break-up of Charlemagne's empire in 843 resulted in a decentralization of political power, which lasted until the modern period. Feudalism characterized the life of the centuries that followed, with the relations of lord and vassal, chivalry, petty warfare and the "hokus-pokus" of medieval "justice."

MEDIEVAL PHILOSOPHY

Scholasticism was the dominant philosophy of the middle ages. This meant that the great minds of the time were devoted to theology instead of scientific questions, and to problems of gaining heaven rather than making the world here a better place in which to live. The dominant and accepted philosophy was one of the fixity of things. It presented in the intellectual world just such a hierarchy as existed in the Church, in the feudal order and even in the towns which presently grew up. It started out with the assumption that the Church possessed all truth by an infallible revelation.

The futility of scholastic thought is illustrated by Anselm's argument for the existence of God. This argument is summarized by Rogers as follows: "We define God as a being than which nothing greater can be thought. Now there is in the mind the idea of such a being. But also, such a being means existence outside the mind, for if it did not, it would fail to be a being than which nothing greater can be thought. A being with the added attribute

of existence is greater than one merely in idea. Therefore, God exists not merely in mind, but also as a real existence outside the mind."

Contact with the Saracens and with the Jews brought medieval Europe again into touch with the Greek philosophers, whom for several centuries they had known only through commentators, if at all. At first, the Church was afraid and proceeded to frown upon Aristotle. But as it perceived the popularity of interpreting and using him for its own purposes, he was taken over in such a way as almost to make him a saint. The following illustration shows the way in which the dictatorship of Aristotle set bounds to the intellect quite as effectually as the Church had previously done through its own dogmas. The story goes that a certain man thought he had discovered spots in the sun. In reply to his claim, one of the schoolmen replied, "My son, I have read Aristotle many times, and I assure you that there is nothing of the kind mentioned by him. Be certain, therefore, that the spots which you have seen are in your eyes and not in the sun."

In the face of such a philosophy as this, it should not surprise us to find that medieval philanthropy never involved the idea of stopping the sources of poverty by removing injustice from the social order. Moreover, we find here simply one more expression of the idea of fixity which we have already seen to have had influence in the statutes of laborers and in the early English Poor Law.

THE CRUSADES

But quite without foreseeing its disorganizing and disruptive consequences, the Church fostered a movement which was destined to break up the rigid medieval system. This movement was the effort of the Church to recover

control of the Holy Land. Now on the surface there was nothing about the Crusades that was inconsistent with the medieval scheme of things. But the setting in motion of large numbers of people meant the break-up of many of the little groups in which the majority lived. It called forth also a volume of commerce which Europe had never before witnessed, and thereby stimulated the growth of the towns with their industry. It was the Crusades, therefore, with their unexpected consequences which we shall study in a later chapter, that provided the occasion for a great deal of medieval philanthropy.

The principal agencies of relief during the later middle ages were the monasteries, the hospital orders, the hospitals which grew out of the earlier xenodochia, the religious fraternities, the alms of individuals and the monts-de-piété or religious loan banks.

THE MONASTERIES

In each abbey of the Benedictines there was a brother called the porter, who regularly distributed money, clothing and provisions. On the eve of great festivals, especially large distributions were made. At Cluny, a special dignitary, called the eleemosinarius, had as his duty the care of the poor. He went to visit the sick in their homes, once a week going into the house himself if it were a man and sending aid by his domestic if it were a woman. Toward the end of the middle ages, the monasteries suffered many abuses. We are told that "in the fifteenth century, and too often in the fourteenth, the monks yielded to idleness and luxury and love for the poor grew cold. The careful investigation and relief of distress among the laboring population in the neighborhood was given up, and nothing remained but indiscriminate almsgiving at the gate." Hence, there was a movement

to regulate the monasteries, both on the part of the Church and of the civil authority. We have already seen how they were completely abolished in England.

HOSPITAL ORDERS

Similar to the philanthropic work of the monasteries was that of the military orders founded in connection with the Crusades. One of the earliest was the order of St. John, whose rule was recognized by Paschalis II in 1113. Raymond de Puy divided the body into three sections: (1) knights who were sworn to eternal warfare against the infidels, (2) clergy who were to attend to the necessary religious ceremonies and distribute alms to the poor, (3) "serventi" who were to care for the poor and the sick. In general, they seem to have set aside a part of each commandery as a hospital, or else to have established a hospital in connection with it. In addition, they maintained a number of separate institutions. There was one in Toulouse, there were three in Florence and one in Posen.

Another of the hospital orders which arose out of the Crusades was the Teutonic Order. This was authorized by Pope Celestin II, in 1142, and developed in Germany especially at the beginning of the thirteenth century. Besides the three ordinary vows of poverty, obedience and chastity, each member was required to consecrate himself particularly to the care of the poor and the sick. Every commandery was expected to have a hospital as an annex. The first one established in northern Europe was the one founded at Halle in 1200. This Order seems to have been well organized and administered, but as time went on its primitive zeal weakened, and in the course of the fifteenth century most of the commanderies disappeared.

Other orders were the Cruciferi, which had fifty-seven establishments in the thirteenth century, chiefly in Italy

and Germany; the Knights of St. James of the Swords placed under the rule of St. Augustine in 1175, which established shelters in Spain for pilgrims; the Order of St. Elizabeth, whose work was principally in Germany. In addition, there were the regular Canons of Penitence established in Italy and afterwards carried to Prague and Cracow. Their function was to provide for the needs of the sick and the burial of the dead.

MONTS-DE-PIÉTÉ

Perhaps the most discriminating and the most constructive of medieval philanthropy was the work of the Monts-de-Piété, or religious loan banks. In spite of the teaching of the Church condemning the taking of usury, very high rates of interest were often charged. Perhaps the general prohibition, and the fear of the lender that his claim would not be supported was one cause of the high rates. In any event we find cases in which the interest would amount in six months to the principal and then be compounded. Lallemand cites various rates from twenty per cent. to fifty per cent. as being common in the fifteenth century. Some attempts had been made to remedy this evil; one establishment for making pledge loans at reasonable rates having been founded in Freisingen in 1198. But these earlier attempts were temporary and disappeared.

The fifteenth century saw the founding of a great many monts-de-piété in Italy. Sometimes they were backed by citizens, very often they were the result of the preaching of some monk or priest. The Franciscans, the real founders of the Monts-de-Piété, followed two aims: to relieve the small people borne down by usury, and to prevent those who possess a bit of property from ruin by borrowing foolishly for frivolous or immoral purposes.

Bernardin de Feltre proposed three principles which he considered the basis of these institutions; deposit of a pledge worth more than the sum loaned, sale of the unclaimed pledge after a definite period and return of the balance to the depositor, and a low rate of interest to cover the cost of administration. These fundamental propositions were generally adopted, and experience confirmed their wisdom.

The statutes of the Monts-de-Piété of Parma (1488) and those of La Mirandola (1495), which with a few variations were merely a reproduction of the rules of Parma, give us an exact idea of the administration of these establishments at the end of the fifteenth century.

The governing board was made up of four ecclesiastics, three doctors, three merchants, and three other laymen. The Depositario, chief receiver of pledges, must be a capable and good man, fearing God. He kept track of everything deposited and wrote everything carefully on the registers. The Capserio or Fattore, the cashier, handled the money. Like the receiver he was chosen for one, two or more years; he might choose one or two employes to help him in his work; and he was responsible for them. As to the place serving as a pawnshop it must be spacious and guarantee safe-keeping. Two controllers, Rasonati-Raxonati, named each year, related neither by blood nor marriage to the receiver or cashier, audited the accounts and registers kept by these functionaries one month after they turned over their office. They received a small compensation for this work. The interest charged at the beginning of this work was naturally modest; at Mirandola it was only five per cent. Nothing was charged small borrowers. Money could be loaned only to citizens who had real need, and not to persons disposed to employ these sums for vain or unworthy purposes.

THE REFORMATION

We have described the development of ecclesiastical charities up to the great division in the Church which took place in the sixteenth century. After the Reformation, the importance of the Church in the field of social work gradually diminished in the Protestant countries, but remained as great as ever in those lands which continued Catholic. In the north of Europe many functions previously administered by the Church were taken over by the civil authorities, and it was quite natural that poor relief should follow this general course. But perhaps the most important reason for the difference in the subsequent development had to do with the doctrine of religious merit of almsgiving. The "indulgences" which were one of the chief bones of contention in the Reformation were quite intimately associated with the idea of securing salvation through alms. It was natural that the Protestants should experience revulsion against this sort of thing, for the time being at least; and as a matter of fact, it never recovered its former influence over the minds and habits of the peoples of northern Europe.

The retention of this doctrine by the Catholic Church was entirely in line with the reactionary position which it assumed after the Reformation. It abandoned the intellectual achievements of the Renaissance, turned its back on humanism and returned to the sterile scholasticism of the middle ages. It set itself against modern science, denied Copernicanism, made Galileo retract his belief that the earth goes round the sun, and burned Giordano Bruno at the stake for similar teachings. It put its iron heel on freedom of speech, and through the Inquisition opposed progress of every sort and retarded the development of Catholic countries.

At the same time the Church instituted many internal reforms, and corrected many of the evils against which Luther and the other Protestants inveighed so strongly. Beginning with Paul III, a series of reforms quite changed the general character of the clergy. But on the whole the position of the Church with respect to charities was that which we have just noted. The Council of Trent (1545–65), which started as an effort to reunite the Christian world, ended, because of the deliberate absence of the Protestants, in a restatement of the old dogmas of the Catholic Church, and a return to the theology and philosophy of Thomas Aquinas. From this time on charity was urged as a means of defending the Church and strengthening its position. It was insisted that charity is a function of the Church exclusively. Hence it was that the modern development of relief by civic agencies came first in northern Europe, and has not even yet really established itself in the Catholic countries.

As exceptions to the statement just made, we may cite a few instances of public relief in countries which remained faithful to Rome. Lille, in 1506, tried to bring the charitable funds of the city together under the supervision of the municipality. Antwerp, in 1521, seems to have had a well-organized bureau. The reforms of Ypres will be discussed more fully in a later chapter. Madrid, in 1544, undertook to work out an elaborate system of public relief. Toulouse, in 1538, levied a tax for the relief of the poor. Paris, in 1582, had a commission to collect alms and visit the poor. Lyons had, in the sixteenth century, a municipal bureau of charity under the direction of laymen. But these were exceptions, and most of these developments were soon suppressed. The vast majority of relief work in France, Spain, Italy and Austria continued

to be done under the direct supervision of the Church, and by agencies founded and approved by the Church.

After the bitterness of the Reformation had somewhat passed away, the Catholic charities began not only to adopt some of the principles worked out by the Protestant, Jewish and secular agencies, but also made their own contributions to the modern techniques of social work. Particularly through the great society of St. Vincent de Paul, founded in 1833, with chapters in almost every country, have the Catholics put into effect most of the principles of the charity organization movement. They have adopted the "case method" of work with individuals and families. They have come to provide excellent institutional care for children and old people, and they have trained specialists in the various fields of social work. One of the most recent efforts in America to train professional workers for the Catholic agencies is the National Service School for Women at Washington, D. C.

It is necessary to note these more recent developments in order that it may be clear that ecclesiastical charities in the twentieth century are by no means what they were in the middle ages; that with relatively few exceptions they follow the same principles and methods as do other organizations. But the time when the Church was the dominant factor in social work has definitely passed. That time was the middle ages.

SUGGESTED READINGS

General

Lallemand, Léon: *Histoire de la Charité.* Paris: *Picard,* 1902-12. 4 vols. in 5.

Ratzinger, Georg: *Geschichte der kirchlichen Armenflege.* Freiburg i. Br., 1884.

Uhlhorn, G.: *Die christliche Liebesthätigkeit.* 3 Bde. Stuttgart, 1884–1890.

Monks and Friars

Montalembert, Charles: *Monks of the West; from St. Benedict to St. Bernard.* Edinburgh: *Blackwood,* 1861–79. 7 vols.

Wishart, A. W.: *Short History of Monks and Monasteries.* Trenton, N. J., 1900.

Palmer, Fr. C. F.: *Life of P. T. Howard, Grand Almoner of Catherine of Braganza.* (Sketch of the rise, mission and influence of the Dominican Order.) London, 1867.

Pouillé General des Abbayes de France et Benefices qui en dependent. Paris: *Alliot,* 1626.

Military and Hospital Orders.

Bristed, Chas. A.: *Military Orders of the Middle Ages.* Cambridge, 1843.

Helyot: *Histoire des Ordres Monastiques, Religeuses et Militaires.* Paris, 1715–1721. 8 vols.

Bedford, W. K., and Holbeche, Richard: *The Order of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem.* London: Robinson, 1902.

Kingsley, Rose G.: *The Order of St. John of Jerusalem.* London: Skeffington, 1918.

Taafe, Sir John: *History of the Holy, Military, Sovereign Order of St. John of Jerusalem.* (Appendix of original material.) London: Hope, 1852.

Oehler, Max: *Geschichte des deutschen Ritterordens.* Elbing: Wernich, 1908–12.

Rink, Joseph Paul: *Die christliche Liebesthätigkeit in Ordensländer Preussen bis 1525.* Breslau, 1911.

Perlbach, Max: *Die Statuten des deutschen Ordens nach den ältesten Handschriften.* Halle, 1890.

Wernher, Adolf: *Die Armen- und Krankenpflege der geistlichen Ritterorden in früherer Zeit.* Berlin, 1874.

CHAPTER XV

THE MEDIEVAL HOSPITAL

THE philanthropy of the medieval Church was of two general types; indiscriminate almsgiving and congregate institutions for all sorts of people. The first, we have already discussed. It is to the second that we shall now devote our attention.

RISE OF THE HOSPITALS

As was indicated in the preceding chapter, the hospital as a type of institution, had its beginning in the xenodochium, which was at the outset a place for the entertainment of travellers but presently came to serve quite a variety of purposes; furnishing shelter for the aged and infirm, the sick and injured, widows, young children and any others who might be in need of assistance.

These xenodochia were usually connected with a parish church. As time went on and their functions multiplied, such institutions were established under a variety of auspices. Sometimes they were attached to a monastery; sometimes to a commandery of one of the military orders; some were founded by bishops and other high Church officials; many others by kings and nobles. Not a few owed their origin to some religious fraternity, and later to a merchant or craft gild. Finally, the new towns took over the management of existing institutions, or founded new ones for the care of their citizens.

In the course of this medieval development we find relatively little differentiation of function, nearly all of the institutions being congregate in character and receiving

the greatest possible variety of needy folk. But there was considerable variation in the names applied. Some were known as hospital or spital; a great many bore the name Maison-Dieu or Domus-Deus. In England we find the name almshouse, and in France Aumônerie. The character of these institutions is not at all that which we have come to associate with the word hospital. Miss Clay has made this very clear. "It was an ecclesiastical, not a medical institution. It was for care rather than for cure: for the relief of the body when possible, but preëminently for the refreshment of the soul. By manifold religious observances, the staff sought to elevate and discipline character. They endeavored, as the body decayed, to strengthen the soul and prepare it for the future life. Faith and love were more predominant features in hospital life than were skill and science."

The surprising thing to the modern student is the very large number of these institutions which were scattered all over medieval Europe. Ashley estimates that there were over 450 in England alone at the time of the Reformation. There were sixteen in the one city of York.

ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

RULES AND REGULATIONS

Admission to one of these institutions was sometimes at the discretion of the warden, but very frequently at the will of the patron. The founder, or other benefactor of a hospital, frequently reserved for himself the right to say by whom one or more of the beds should be occupied. In some of the hospitals it appears that the candidate had also to be approved by his future companions.

The appointment of the staff members was usually in the hands of the patron who, as we have already seen,

might be a noble, a bishop, a wealthy burgess, or the representative of some organization like the gilds. In a few privileged houses, the staff brothers were permitted to select a superior from their own midst and nominate him to the patron.

The rules concerning payment and property were often very much like those in modern homes for the aged. In some cases the candidate for admission was required to make a payment; for example, at Dover 100s. Other hospitals had ordinances forbidding this practise, but evidently this prohibition was easily got around, for at St. Nicholas Hospital in York it was provided that " without the fear of simony, the property of an incoming brother might be received if given spontaneously and absolutely." Both staff and inmates were frequently under the threefold vow of chastity, obedience and poverty. In early days a total renunciation of personal goods was required of the inmates of many leper hospitals. But in others this rule was never made or else was later relaxed. The goods of a deceased member were ordinarily distributed among the surviving inmates.

The rules of conduct generally required that the brothers and sisters of the hospital staff be rigidly separated, except at worship or at work. But in the case of inmates who were not "professed," the men and women seem to have lived a common life. From the modern point of view there was a curious mixture of strictness and laxity, particularly with reference to the lepers. This was probably due to the fact that the rules were a matter of discipline rather than of health.

For violation of rules, various punishments were inflicted by the warden; among them, flogging, fasting, fines, the stocks, suspension and expulsion.

THE STAFF

The internal authority was usually vested in the warden, whose power was frequently very great. But he was subject to supervision from without on the part of the patron or his agents. If an institution were maintained by a town or by a gild, its representatives would act as visitors.

The staff of a medieval hospital was in charge of a warden, who was also known as master, prior, custos, keeper or rector. He was usually a priest, but occasionally a layman, and in a few instances was described as a physician. Under the warden were a number of brothers who might be priests, monks or lay-brethren. One of them, known as the proctor, was the financial agent. His duties were "to preach and collect alms." Women were frequently employed for bedside care of the sick and various domestic duties. Some of the staff were merely pensioners or beneficiaries who turned their property over to the hospital and in return received their living. In addition to the regular staff, there were sometimes paid servants who acted as cooks, bakers, brewers, smiths, carters, laundresses, etc. Finally, there were the inmates, the sick, the lame, the blind, the poor and passing pilgrims. These, too, were a part of the working force, for even if they could do nothing else, they were employed at praying for their benefactors.

THE RELIGIOUS LIFE

As we observed before, the daily life in the hospital was essentially religious. Both staff and inmates were required to attend mass and keep the canonical hours. All who were able to be up had to attend chapel, and the bedridden patients worshipped at the same time. In many cases a knowledge of the Psalter of the Blessed Virgin,

which was the standard form of worship for the illiterate, was required as a condition of admission to the hospital. It is said of some of the lazar-houses that admission to them was equivalent to taking up the life of a "religious." The lepers at Dover were required to say two hundred Paternosters and Aye Marias by day and as many by night. One member of the staff roused them from their sleep by ringing the dormitory bell and the prayers were repeated by the inmates sitting erect in bed. Each inmate of St. Bartholomew's at Sandwich was required to take a solemn vow binding himself to

"be obedient w^t^ hooly deuocyon prayyng for the founder of this place . . . . . and in especiall I shall be at the bedys (bedes) in the churche, and at matynys, and atte messe, and euensong and complyne, as the custome of maner is and usage—so help me God, and all holy dome, and all seints of heuen."

The almsmen of Ewelme said the following prayer each night at the founders' tombs:

"God have mercy on the sowle of the noble prince Kyng Harry the Sext and of the sowles of my Lord William sum tyme Duke of Suffolke, and my lady Alice Duchesse of Suffolke his wyfe, oure fyrst fownders, and of theyr fadyr and modyr sowles & all cristen sowles."

William Wynard, recorder of the town of Exeter, built a hospital and drew up the following prayer for the use of inmates:

"O Lord Jesu Christ, Son of the Living God, have mercy upon Thy servant William founder of this place, as Thou wilt and as Thou knowest best; bestow upon him strong hope, right faith and unshadowed love, and grant to him a good end, which is a gift above all others. Amen."

A similar prayer was used by the inmates of an almshouse at Lichfield:

"O God, who by the grace of the Holy Spirit, the Comforter, pourest the gifts of charity into the hearts of the faithful, grant to thy servant William the bishop, our founder, and grant to Thy servants and to Thy handmaids, for whom we implore Thy clemency, health of mind and body; that they may love Thee with all their strength, and with all joyfulness perform such things as please thee; through Christ our Lord. Amen.'"

In the large hospitals founded by the Order of St. John of Jerusalem, special litanies were recited at nightfall. The inmates prayed for the advancement of Christianity, the welfare of the Pope, the kings and princes, pilgrims, prisoners in the hands of the Saracens and for those whose alms supported the hospital.

PHYSICAL CARE

The fact that emphasis was put chiefly on the care of the soul did not mean necessarily that the body was neglected. However, the provision for physical comfort was very different from that to be found in modern institutions. As to food, there were three classes of menus; one for the regular inmates from day to day, another for religious festivals, and another for casual sojourners. Just what the food was we are not told. Lighting was, of course, by candles, and heating was from wood collected in the vicinity by the permission of the manorial lord.

In the early middle ages the sick and the poor slept on pallets of straw, but wooden bedsteads seem to have been introduced about the twelfth century. For a long time real beds were so scarce that it was regarded as a matter of some importance for a dying patron or pensioner to leave his bed to the hospital. We are told also that there was great difficulty in keeping the beds clean, and it is regarded as quite noteworthy that in one hospital the

sum of 46s. 8d. was set aside annually for washing the bedclothes. We learn that bathing, washing of the head, shaving, and changes of clothing were provided for in the better hospitals. This suggests that none too much attention was given to them in a great many instances. As to clothing, there was usually a special habit for the staff, another for the almsmen and a third for lepers. An interesting sidelight on the attitude toward the lepers appears in the statutes of S. Julian's. They ought "as well in their conduct as in their garb to bear themselves as men despised, and as more humble than the rest of their fellowmen."

FINANCIAL SUPPORT

The funds for maintaining these hospitals came from endowments, bequests, fairs, admission fees, contributions both voluntary and involuntary, and the alms of pilgrims.

In England the sheriff of the county was sometimes responsible for turning over to a hospital the profits from crown lands; sometimes there were rents from real estate, and sometimes grants were made on account of a vacant bishopric. In addition there were endowments in kind, the kings, for instance, making grants from royal forests. Men of humble circumstances, as well as kings and nobles, sometimes left money to the hospitals. But in general they seem to have depended upon the nobility and the clergy.

The funds of privileged charities were often assisted by fairs. These were gala occasions, usually held at the festival of the patron saint of the hospital. Ordinarily, they lasted two or three days, but sometimes they were so profitable that they were continued for as much as a fortnight. Another important source of revenue was the admission fee to which we have already referred.

Theoretically, the contributions made to hospitals were voluntary. An interesting example, however, of

involuntary contributions is involved in the privilege which King John of England conferred upon the lepers of Shrewsbury. He gave them authority to dip their hands into sacks in the market-place and take out handfuls of corn and flour. Most of the contributions were gifts of food, clothing, etc., rather than money. Sometimes they were brought in by the donors, but usually collectors went after them. Sometimes the inmates themselves went about begging. If the proctor or other collector went beyond his own neighborhood, he had to secure a "protection," or warrant, from a king or bishop. Thus, Henry III endorsed the cause of St. Giles at Shrewsbury in these words: "That when the brethren come to you to beg alms, you will favorably admit them and mercifully impart to them your alms of the goods conferred by God upon you." In addition, there were appeals authorized by the Church, frequently in the form of indulgences. Some of these documents we have already examined in our discussion of the religious merit of almsgiving.

Finally, the alms of passing pilgrims constituted frequently an important source of income. Especially if a hospital possessed some well-known relic would gifts be made by those who sought healing in its presence. We are told that the Maison-Dieu at Dunwich possessed a cross of great reputation "whither many resorted to adore it, who bestowed much alms." When this relic was taken away, the inmates were greatly impoverished.

DECLINE OF THE HOSPITALS

It can be readily seen from this brief account that even at the best the medieval hospital was ill equipped to care for those who sought shelter at its door. But unfor-

tunately, it was not always at its best and abuses appeared which still further reduced the usefulness of these institutions.

Frequently the patrons demanded in return for their benevolence, maintenance free of charge whenever they desired it. Sometimes, official visitors used these institutions as hostelries for themselves and their friends. Frequently the privilege of board and lodging was given away by patrons as a reward for service, and sometimes the "corrodies," as they were called, were sold outright by greedy officials. So serious did this evil become in England that a statute of 1315 provided that "there shall be no more grants of 'corrodies' at the king's requests."

There seems to have been much litigation about patronage. Representatives of the first founder and those of later benefactors quarrelled over their respective claims. Another abuse was the practise of keeping important posts unfilled. The same Parliament which checked Edward III by the statute just mentioned received a petition stating that hospitals were impoverished and destroyed by temporary guardians during the vacancy of the warden's position. Frequently the patrons neglected personal supervision of the hospitals and as a consequence there were many abuses by the wardens and the staff. It was reported of one warden, about the year 1300, that "he defrauded the poor of their alms, locked up the rooms where strangers and sick should have been accommodated and neglected the chapel." Occasionally investigations by parliamentary authority, or by the towns, brought out evidence that in many hospitals the members of the staff were living about as they pleased, carrying on outside business and neglecting their duties in the institution. Not a few of the wardens were non-residents, and some of them had charge of several institutions. A youth of

eighteen was appointed warden at Portsmouth, and the master of Newton Garth, 1427, was a boy of sixteen.

The decline of the hospitals in the later middle ages is well described in Ashley's summary of Ratzinger's conclusions. "In Germany, he tells us, the usual course of events, long before the end of the Middle Ages, was as follows: the hospital, intended originally for the poor, came to be looked upon by its clerical administrators as a source of income, and at last was regarded very much in the same light as a rich benefice. The descent was the more facile because from the twelfth century onward most of the hospitals were exempted from the control of their diocesan. Those hospitals which were subject to the General of the Order of the Holy Ghost were regularly bestowed upon Roman prelates, to be held *in commendam*. In France things were even worse. 'The whole history of the French hospitals in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries is one of constant abuse. In some cases this was due to the usurpation of the heads of the houses, who dissipated the property of the hospitals, or used them for their own advantage; who left the attendants without means of support and refused to admit the sick and hungry.' It was, therefore, 'fortunate for suffering humanity, and the best thing that could happen for the institutions,' that in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries such of them as still survived fell into the hands of the burgesses of the several towns, and usually under the direction of the magistrates; an arrangement which was confirmed by an ordinance of Louis XI in 1463."

The condition of things in England is thus described by a statute of 1414: "Many hospitals, founded as well by the noble kings of this realm, and lords and ladies, both spiritual and temporal, as well as by others of divers estates to the honour of God and of His glorious Mother, in aid

and merit of the souls of the said founders, to the which hospitals the same founders have given largely of their moveable goods for the buildings of the same, and largely also of their lands and tenements wherewith to sustain old men and women, lazars, men and women out of their senses and memories, poor women with child, and other poor persons, and there to relieve, nourish and refresh them (many such hospitals) are now in most part decayed, and the goods and profits of the same by divers persons, both spiritual and temporal, withdrawn and spent in other uses, whereby many men and women have died in great misery, for default of aid, living and succour."

Further evidence appears in a pamphlet called a "Supplication for the Beggars," written about 1529. It says, "What remedy to relieve us your poor, sick, lame and sore bedmen? To make many hospitals for the relief of the poor people? Nay, truly, the more the worse, for ever the fat of the whole foundation hangeth on the priests' beards."

Finally, the failure of the hospitals to meet the needs of the poor appears in the encouragement which they gave to the practice of begging. The proctors whom they sent about to beg for contributions were frequently described as "sturdy lubbers" who lived on the fat of the land and scandalized decent people by their behavior. They were so numerous and their credentials so easily forged that there grew up a whole swarm of fraudulent imitators. Then again, the larger hospitals particularly offered food and lodging to all who applied, providing they had the superficial appearance of need. While they may have made some attempt to distinguish vagrants from other applicants, it was not possible for them to make any careful inquiry. Hence it was easy for vagabonds to go "from spital to spital, prowling and poaching for lumps of bread

and meat." Thus, while the hospitals did relatively little good, on the one hand, they were responsible for much harm on the other.

BEGINNINGS OF SPECIALIZED INSTITUTIONS

In contrast to the usual congregate institution, such as we have described, there was slowly developing specialized care for different groups of needy people.

During the middle ages, the insane, feeble-minded and epileptic were often regarded as possessed of devils or bewitched. Outside of accusations of sorcery, they were generally regarded as harmless and allowed to wander about subject to public derision. If they became dangerous they were shut up in common prisons. There was no thought of cure, but only of public safety. Even in the French law of 1791, the mentally abnormal were dealt with as animals, and persons who had assumed their care were held responsible for any danger they might do.

But a change began slowly to be made. The various types of mental deviates were not yet differentiated, but at least they were gradually separated from persons of normal mentality. Bedlam Hospital in London is said to have received such patients before 1400. Originally, Bedlam seems to have been a priory, but Henry VIII turned it into a hospital especially for the mentally abnormal. An asylum was founded at Valencia, Spain, in 1409, by Fray Gofre Gilberto, who had seen similar establishments among the Moors. He started a society for their care, which was called Association de los Innocentos. A religious fraternity authorized in 1561 by Pope Pius IV had charge of what seems to have been the first asylum in Italy. At Modena, in 1654, there was an institution for observation of persons suspected of being mentally unsound. In Germany, The Netherlands, France and

even in Russia, there was a similar movement. Lazar-houses were now scarcely needed; and in Germany, convents were sometimes turned into lunatic asylums. Of course, as yet, there was no notion of curing people suffering from the various diseases which are included in the term insanity, but even to provide separate custodial care was a step in advance of the medieval system.

Special institutions for the blind seem to have come still later. Just when they first appeared, we do not know. But down to the eighteenth century the blind seem almost everywhere to have been left to the chance alms of charitable individuals. Sometimes, it is interesting to note, they formed fraternities of their own in order to beg to better advantage. The education of the blind seems first to have been put on a solid basis by Valentin Haüy, who was born in 1745 in Picardy. He first educated a lad named Francois Le Sueur, and used him to demonstrate the possibilities. In 1785, the Société Philanthropique allowed twelve pounds a month for the benefit of twelve blind youths. From this an institution grew. Raised letters enabled the blind to read. They were also taught spinning, knitting, making thread, cord, lace, upholstering, printing, music, etc.

It was in Spain, the land of notable exceptions, that the first systematic attempt to consider the deaf and dumb as rational beings, and to show that they were capable of articulate speech, was made by Pedro de Ponce, a Spanish monk, at Sahagun, and confessor to the King. This benevolent ecclesiastic in 1570 instructed four deaf and dumb pupils in speech. In 1620 Juan Pablo Bonet wrote a book called " Reduccion de las letras y arte para ensenara hablar los mudos." He presented the following methods: pantomime, written alphabet, sign language, gutteral alphabet. His students were few in number and belonged,

as did those of Ponce, to noble and wealthy families. John Wallis, an Oxford professor, succeeded in making some deaf mutes talk in 1660. A Swiss, Jean Conrad Amman (d. 1724), pretented to teach lip-reading in two months, but he was a pure fake. Charles Michel de l'Epée (b. 1712) developed a method of mimicry, and also employed lip-reading. He received rich children only by special arrangement. It was the poor deaf mutes in whom he was most interested.

At the opening of the modern period there were already foundling asylums in Italy and Spain. Elsewhere these infants were usually taken into the hospitals. Illegitimate and some legitimate children were frequently left at the doors of churches, monasteries and hospitals. During the early modern period foundling asylums appear all over Europe.

The religious purpose of many is illustrated by the Work-house and Foundling Asylum established in Dublin by the English government (1702–1704). Its purpose was to save the lives of foundlings "and secondly to educate and rear children taken charge of by the Institution in the Reformed or Protestant Faith and thereby to strengthen and promote the Protestant Interest in Ireland."

The ease with which a mother could dispose of her child, and the awful mortality among these infants are suggested by Dudley Wodworth's account of this Dublin institution in 1730. "A cradle, or turning wheel, for taking the infants in, and a bell were provided at the gate for use by day or night. . . . . and this cradle was but too often only the preliminary coffin of thousands of wretched little beings who were consigned to its cold clasp."

In contrast to the medieval hospital and the slow beginnings of specialized care, consider the multiplication

of highly specialized institutions in our modern communities. First, the hospital is a place for the care of sick people. But not only do we have general hospitals; we have others specially devoted to children, to maternity cases, to people suffering from communicable diseases, and to psycopathic patients. Our institutions for mental deviates are of several different types. There are custodial institutions for chronic cases of insanity, low grade imbeciles and idiots. There are institutions of the colony type for convalescents and for higher grade feeble minded persons. There are semi-educational institutions for morons. Similiarly, our homes for the blind, the deaf and the dumb are custodial only for the infirm, are educational for the young and industrial for able-bodied adults. Our children's institutions, while often of the congregate orphanage type, are more and more specialized as hospitals, schools, and receiving stations. Our almshouses are more and more becoming homes for the aged and infirm. There are still many relics of the middle ages with us, but this simple enumeration is sufficient to indicate the long steps forward which have already been taken.

SUGGESTED READINGS

Clay, Rotha Mary: *The Medieval Hospitals of England.* London: Methuen, 1909.

Bedford, W. K.: *Notes on Old Hospitals of the Order.* (St. John of Jerusalem.) London: Harrison, 1881.

Bedford, W. K. (translator): *Regulations of the Old Hospital of the Knights of St. John at Valetta,* from a copy printed at Rome and preserved in the Archives of Malta.

Nutting, M. A., and Dock, L. L.: *History of Nursing.* New York: Putnams, 1907–12. 4 vols.

Haesar, F.: *Geschichte christlicher Krankenpflege und Pflegerschaften.* Berlin, 1857.

Julius, Nicolaus Heinrich: *An Essay on the Public Care for the Sick as Produced by Christianism.* Hamburg, 1825.

See also list of readings for Chapter XIV.

PART V

MUTUAL AID IN MEDIEVAL COMMUNITIES

CHAPTER XVI

MANOR AND PARISH

WHENEVER we find members of the same family, intimate neighborhood or club helping one another, we are not accustomed to describe this as charity or philanthropy or social work. These words do not seem to fit. Charity, as such, appears to have arisen out of the necessity of doing something for those who did not belong to the same "primary" group with the benefactor. It was their detachment, coupled with their distress, that furnished the occasion for what we call welfare work.

But even these would hardly have called forth organized philanthropy had there not been some powerful incentive. Now the medieval world did have such an incentive in the doctrine of the religious merit of almsgiving. Ordinarily, the outsider, the foreigner, the stranger, was viewed with suspicion. He was a potential, if not an actual, enemy. But if he were suffering or in distress, he was a potential asset, for he provided an opportunity to exercise the Christian virtue of charity. All this we have discussed in a previous chapter.

It is our purpose here to study the transition from the simple situation in which practically everyone belonged to some simple group and stayed pretty closely at home to the more complex life of a mobile population with many detached individuals. We shall examine the parallel development of mutual aid and neighborliness into relatively formal and organized relief-giving.

PRIMARY GROUP LIFE

FIXITY AND ISOLATION

After the break-up of Charlemagne's Empire in the ninth century, the political life of western Europe was pretty thoroughly decentralized. The same disorganization seems to have occurred in the economic realm as well. This meant that through the middle ages most people lived in small groups and had exceedingly little to do with outsiders.

To be sure, there were feudal relations, whereby the lord of a manor was bound to some great overlord, king or emperor. But even down into the modern period this had relatively little effect upon the lives of the people who made up the average medieval community.

The social structure of the middle ages may be described as an enormous number of small and practically independent units. Within one of these local groups, be it manor, parish, gild or religious community everybody was intimately acquainted with everybody else. As a general thing there was blood kinship between the members of such a group. Moreover, they carried on whatever activities were necessary for their existence, raising their own food, making their own clothing and otherwise supplying their various wants. Whatever they produced was for home consumption, and trade with other communities was so slight as to be well-nigh negligible.

The relation with outsiders and the members of other communities was usually one of hostility, which meant that there was almost no social contact in a real sense of the term. Wars between the various nobles involved the population in an almost continual state of belligerence. These petty wars consisted in a sudden invasion of neighboring territory, devastation of the fields, perhaps a laying

siege to the castle, a bit of open fighting, perhaps the capture of some nobleman and the payment of a ransom by his retainers. Against this continuous fighting the Church set itself, though with rather limited success. However, it did secure more or less recognition for the "Peace of God," whereby women, clergymen and merchants were exempted from the fighting, and for the "Truce of God," which was an attempt to restrict fighting so as to have none on Sundays, Feast Days, etc. At one time the "Truce of God" covered the period from Wednesday night to Monday morning.

Other factors which contributed to the isolation of the little communities in which medieval folk lived were the very great difficulties of travel. The roads were exceedingly bad, and because of the decentralization of government, every few miles the traveller had to pass through the territory of a new ruler. This meant the payment of frequent tolls and customs duties, especially at bridges and ferries. Besides, the bridges often were not kept up. And then there were the "Robber Barons," impoverished noblemen who had their retainers lie in wait for passing merchants and others who might be forced to contribute to the lord's treasury. All these things are bound up with the fact that until the later middle ages there was exceedingly little commerce, although this was never wholly absent from the countries of western Europe. Moreover, there were occasional travellers going on pilgrimages or participating in the crusades.

Perhaps the difficulties of travel and the extreme isolation will be more fully appreciated if stated negatively in terms of facilities which the twentieth century possesses but which were altogether lacking in the tenth century. There were no railroads, no electric lines, no automobiles or airplanes, no telephones, no telegraph or wireless. There were

practically no hotels, almost no books and absolutely no newspapers or magazines. As a matter of fact, there were exceedingly few people who were even able to read and write. Thus there were practically none of those things which make it possible for us to associate directly and indirectly with people of every race and nation. It was practically impossible for medieval folk to have any contact with people beyond the local group in which they lived, worked, played and worshipped.

LAWS AGAINST DETACHMENT FROM THE GROUP

Not only do we find a very high degree of isolation and fixity, both geographical and social, but we find also a strong feeling against any deviation from this manner of living. Whenever anyone undertook to break away from the community in which he had been born and reared, he was faced with well-nigh insurmountable difficulties. The majority of the people were serfs, bound to the soil even more firmly than the Mississippi negroes are bound to the sugar and cotton plantations. Travelling ecclesiastics had to have special credentials from a bishop or the Pope. Itinerate merchants were viewed with suspicion and were controlled by strict regulations. A few quotations from early English laws may serve to illustrate the fixity of status and geographical location which seems to have been general throughout medieval Europe. A law of Ine, King of Wessex from 688 to 725, provided thus to prevent the itinerate merchant from handling stolen property:

"If a chapman traffic up among the people, let him do it before witnesses. If stolen property be attached with a chapman, and he have not bought it before good witnesses, let him prove, according to the wite (fine), that he was neither privy (to the theft) nor thief; or pay as wite xxxvi shillings."

King Alfred (871–901) restricted those whom the chapman took in his train. "It is also directed to chapmen, that they bring the men whom they take up with them before the king's reeve at the folk-mote, and let it be stated how many of them there are; and let them take such men with them as they may be able afterwards to present for justice at the folk-mote."

King Ine also tried to prevent the harboring of fugitive theows (slaves) and ceorls (lowest freedmen). "If a man accuse a 'ceorlish' man of harboring a fugitive, let him clear himself according to his own 'wer.' If he can not, let him pay for him according to his own 'wer'; (compensation) and the geithsman (military follower of king or lord) in like manner according to his 'wer.'"

Again: If "anyone go from his lord without leave, or steal himself away into another shire, and he be discovered, let him go where he was before, and pay to his lord lx shillings."

Finally, we may quote a paragraph from one of the laws of King Aethelstan, who reigned in the tenth century. "And we have ordained: respecting those lordless men of whom no law can be got, that the kindred be commanded that they domicile him to folk-right, and find him a lord in the folk-mote; and if they then will not or can not produce him at the term, then be he thenceforth a 'flyma' (runaway), and let him slay him for a thief who can come at him: and whoever after that shall harbor him, let him pay for him according to his 'wer' or by it clear himself."

Thus it seems clearly to have been felt that the normal thing was for everyone to belong to some local group and to remain there throughout his life. In so far as there was recognition of social problems, they were felt to have arisen in connection with those who wandered away from home, and their solution was sought in the preservation

of an immobile population. This idea of fixity continued for many centuries, attaining renewed prominence in the Statutes of Laborers, which we have already discussed in connection with the early English Poor Law, and persisting later in the " Settlement Acts."

During the middle ages such legislation was directed against a relatively small number of detached individuals, but as time went on and the population became more mobile increasing numbers of people were conscious of restriction of their activity. The " Settlement Acts " in England and corresponding laws on the Continent made a man's village almost a prison. Some vestiges of the notion that fixity is the normal thing still appear. There is still popular suspicion of the itinerant merchant, and the immigrant, and the colored people who go from Southern plantations to the North. The registration for military service assumes a measure of permanence, and it was strongly urged by many influential persons after the armistice that all soldiers should be returned to the place of their induction or enlistment. The fact that these ideas persist suggests how very powerful they must have been in the middle ages when the incentives and facilities for travel were infinitesimal compared with those of to-day.

THE MANOR

We come now to a more detailed discussion of life in some of the simple communities of the middle ages. The simplest unit was known in England as a " manor " and on the Continent as a "fief " or " beneficium." This consisted usually of a few hundred acres which were technically the possession of a lord, who, however, owed more or less definite fealty to some over-lord or king. Under him there were sometimes "free" tenants, with relatively modern relations to the lord. But for the most part, the

occupants of the land were "tenants in common." They did not pay rent in the modern sense, but owed the lord certain services, such as working on that part of the estate reserved by the lord for his own use, carting, etc. In addition, there were dues in money, or in kind. Sometimes a poll tax was imposed. Often there were fees for the use of the lord's grist mill, wine press, etc.

The usual "fief" or "manor" consisted of a village with several hundred acres of arable land surrounding it. The cultivators of the soil lived in this village rather than in isolated farm houses, as do the agricultural folk in America to-day. Beyond the fields, there were stretches of pasture and waste land and of woodland, where the pigs might forage for food. The arable area was divided up into two portions. A considerable part was kept in the hands of the lord, and cultivated under his direction, or that of his representative, for his own personal benefit. This was known as the "demesne." The rest was parcelled out among the tenants. Now the holdings of the several tenants or villeins, as they frequently were called, were not compact fields but a number of acre or half-acre strips scattered over the whole of the tillable area. Each man had several separate strips in each of the three fields, which were not separated by fences or hedges, but simply by "balks" of unplowed turf.

The significant thing about the intermixed holdings in the open fields was that each man was bound to cultivate his strips in accordance with the rotation of crops observed by his neighbors. There were also other forms of common action and coöperation. The cattle of all the tenants were turned out to graze over the stubble after the grain was cut, as well as over the one great field whose turn it was to lie fallow in that particular year. They

turned their cattle out upon the common pasture or waste, sometimes in proportion to the size of their holdings, and sometimes "without stint." They seem in many cases to have employed a village herdsman, shepherd or swineherd. Thus the whole land of the manor seems to have been cultivated on an elaborate system of joint labor, and even the raising of stock seems to have been generally a coöperative enterprise. These common activities bound the people together in a manner far more effective than anything we know in the modern world. Everyone's work was so bound up with that of the entire community that he had exceedingly little opportunity for individuality or to use any initiative, and custom ruled supreme. But not only was the economic life a community rather than an individual affair; the same thing was true of the legal, religious and the general social life.

As a usual thing, each manor had its own law courts for the maintenance of order. At frequent intervals court was held at the manor house or the castle, attended by all the villagers, for the punishment of petty offenses and the transfer of holdings. All the villagers attended the same church. Very often so large a portion of the tithes was taken by the bishop or other high ecclesiastical official that the priest had to be content with the altar dues, and was glad enough to get a few acres of land, and add to his income by joining in the common agriculture.

In general, the only important social distinction was between the family of the lord, on the one hand, and the villagers on the other. The latter formed a very simple and relatively undifferentiated social organization. But even among them, there appear to have been some distinctions which increased as the middle ages advanced. There were frequently some whose holdings were unusually small and who did not possess any oxen or plow. There were

frequently some laborers whose status differed little, if at all, from that of slaves. But these distinctions were as nothing when contrasted with the gulf that separated the peasants from the nobility. The villagers all worked in the same way and their manner of life was the same. The system of joint cultivation and the life of the village street made them feel their common interests. The absence of money also contributed to the personal nature of relations between the inhabitants of the manor.

As we have already intimated, the great majority were bound to the soil, at least in the sense that the lord would demand a heavy fine before he would give one of his vassals permission to leave the estate. A father might buy permission for his son to become a monk, and younger sons might go off to one of the towns to seek their fortune in one of the craft gilds. But ordinarily a tenant would not be likely to leave unless he could get some land on some other estate. This he could not gain if he went empty-handed, and he was pretty certain to have to go empty-handed, because of the general rule that villeins should not sell their live stock without permission.

MUTUAL AID

It is interesting to observe that there is no historical mention of charity within the manor or fief. When anyone suffered misfortune, he was among friends and relatives who were accustomed to share all the experiences of life and who would, therefore, attend to his need. Now distress and poverty were surely no less frequent in the middle ages than to-day, but the difference is that whereas now we usually face misfortune as individuals, then the burden was assumed by these little compact neighborhood groups. If there were a crop failure it affected the entire estate. If there were an epidemic, the absence of sanitary

conveniences and medical knowledge meant that it would sweep through the entire village. If there was a fire, an accident, or a death, the burden was not allowed to rest upon an individual or his immediate family, but was shared by all his neighbors. There were plenty of causes of distress, but there was no occasion for organized charity.

THE PARISH

THE RISE OF PAROCHIAL RELIEF

Very similar to the manor, and sometimes identical with it, was the parish. Originally, of course, the parish consisted in the members of a church in the midst of a non-Christian community. But with the spread of Christianity and its recognition as the state religion, the parish and the community came more and more to be identified. Probably it often included a number of small manors, but in the nature of the case, it was a very restricted area. In the beginning the parish was a mutual aid group, the members of which looked out for each other, especially during the era of persecutions. Moreover, during the early centuries of the Christian Era, the number of people who travelled from place to place was large enough so that it became necessary to make some definite provision for them. Hence arose the xenodochia, which we have previously discussed, and other provisions for strangers, the sick, the aged and orphans. Even as late as Charlemagne's time, we find the order going forth that the tithes of each parish must be divided into three or four parts, one of which was to be allotted to the care of the poor.

The English law-givers seem to have followed the Continental precedent very closely. An ordinance ascribed to Egbert, Archbishop of York, ran as follows: "The priests are to take tithes of the people, and to make a

written receipt of the names of the givers, and according to the authority of the canons, they are to divide them in the presence of men that fear God." The first part they were to take for the adornment of the church, but the second they were "in all humanity mercifully to distribute with their own hands for the use of the poor and strangers." The third part, however, the priests were to reserve for themselves.

DECLINE

With the decentralization after the break-up of Charlemagne's empire, and perhaps before that, the parochial system of relief gave way. Probably the fact that local needs were met by simple neighborliness and mutual aid, together with the diminished number of travellers, made the formal charity of the parish priest unnecessary. At all events, the historians recognize a decline of relief-giving in the parish. "The old rules as to the employment of tithes, even as soon as the twelfth century, were in many places"—so we are told by a contemporary—"not only little regarded but well-nigh forgotten."

REVIVAL

In the late middle ages, there seems, however, to have been something of a revival of parish philanthropy. It is quite natural that such should have been the case, for this was a period of revival of commence, of the break-up of feudalism, and the detaching of individuals from their various primary groups.

"We can trace in many places the gradual growth in the fifteenth century of a small capital, known as the Church *stock* or *store*,—a fund which was managed by *wardens*, who lent it to trustworthy persons on good security at a high rate of interest, and from the proceeds

met the cost of repairs to the church fabric, and gave assistance to poor parishioners. The stock was sometimes live stock, a form in which its employment did not come into conflict, as the granting of loans might do, with the popular prejudice against usury. 'There were,' says one of the English reformers, 'in some towns (*i.e.*, townships or villages) six, some eight, and some a dozen kyne, gyven unto a stocke, for the reliefe of the poore, and used in such wyse that the poore cotingers, which coulde make any provision for fodder, had the milk for a very small hyre; and then, the number of the stocke reserved, all maner of vailes besydes—both the hyre of the mylke, and the pryces of the yonge veales, and olde fat wares—was disposed to the reliefe of the poore.'

"Where there was no permanent stock the same two purposes, the repairs of the church and the relief of the poor, were often provided for from the proceeds of Church Ales at Whitsuntide,—festive gathering usually in the Church House or Church Tavern, where the ale which had been brewed from the gifts of corn was paid for by the drinkers; so that, as a bitter Puritan put it, 'he that sat the closest to it was accounted the godliest man of all.'"

In the sixteenth century the parish was adopted in the Protestant countries as a civil unit, primarily for the purpose of administering poor relief. This development we have already traced in England, and we may fairly assume that it was not greatly different in the other countries that broke away from the Church of Rome.

MODERN PARALLELS

In conclusion, it is interesting to note the similarity between the simple neighborhood life of the medieval manor and parish with certain isolated communities of modern America. In the back country of the Appalachian

Mountains, there can still be found districts in which everyone is more or less related to all the rest, where everyone has intimate knowledge of all his neighbors, and where there is, in spite of an individualism that was absent from the medieval world, a certain community spirit. At least as over against outsiders, all the members of such a community share the same religious experiences, the same amusements, and coöperate in certain parts of their work, as in barn-raisings and corn-huskings. There is poverty, but not pauperism; there is mutual aid, but not charity.

The absence of any indigenous charities in such communities is evidence of the correctness of our thesis that organized philanthropy arose as a means of dealing with people who were detached from their primary group. Many a Red Cross field representative can testify to the difficulty of creating an interest in social work, not only among these most isolated communities, but in the rural districts generally. The need is not felt because the members of these more or less self-sufficing groups help each other in time of need without any formality. In case of a fire, sickness, accident, death, or other misfortune, the neighbors turn in and help, offering food and clothing, nursing the sick and comforting the bereaved.

The one important difference between the medieval situation and the modern isolated community is that the latter can, if it wishes, avail itself of professional services which will meet these same needs in a more effective manner than will neighborliness alone. But in the middle ages there were no public health nurses and no trained social workers. The members of any local group possessed practically as great knowledge and skill as did any outsider. In other words, there was not yet differentiated any professional class or classes.

SUGGESTED READINGS

Andrews, Chas. M.: *The Old English Manor.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1892.

Davies, Maude F.: *Life in an English Village.* London: Unwin, 1909.

Gomme, Geo. L.: *The Village Community.* London, 1890.

Hone, N. J.: *The Manor and Manorial Records.* New York: Dutton, 1906.

Seebohm, F.: *The English Village Community.* London, 1905.

Sims, N. L.: *The Rural Community.* New York. Scribners, 1920.

Ashley, W. J.: *An Introduction to English Economic History.* London: Longmans Green, 1893, 2 vols.

Trotter, Eleanor: *Seventeenth Century Life in the Country Parish.* Cambridge: *University Press,* 1919.

Cambridge Medieval History. New York: Macmillan, 1911-13, 2 vols.

Munro, D. C., and Sellery, G. C.: *Medieval Civilization.* New York: Century, 1904.

Pennsylvania Translations and Reprints. IV, 3. Documents Illustrative of Feudalism. 1898, III, 5. English Manorial Documents. Philadelphia, 1896.

CHAPTER XVII

THE MEDIEVAL GILDS

THROUGHOUT the middle ages the vast majority of people lived under conditions very similar to those described in the preceding chapter. In other words, society as controlled by the Church and nobility was almost entirely agricultural. But there were always a few persons moving about from place to place, usually going on some pilgrimage, crusade or war. Out of the movements of the roving Normans, the general spirit of knight-errantry, the pilgrimages and crusades, there came a movement of goods which was the beginning of modern European commerce. It was the Italians who first appeared in this new activity, for they provided transports and furnished supplies for the crusaders. On their return voyages they began to bring back Oriental cargoes. Thus a taste for foreign goods was cultivated and industry was stimulated to produce goods for exchange with the East.

MERCHANT GILDS

Presently there grew up organizations remotely similar to our Chambers of Commerce. These were known as "merchant gilds," and were formed primarily for the purpose of obtaining and maintaining the privilege of carrying on trade. Because their privileges were often very dearly bought from the nobility and the royal power, they were jealously guarded by the members of the gild, who frequently acquired monopolies of the trade in their home towns, and also liberty to trade in other towns.

The "merchant gilds" seem to have made their

appearance in the course of the eleventh century. During the next hundred years or so, they came to be a recognized part of the town constitution, and performed numerous governmental functions. They were from the outset composed of the most influential citizens, and hence early succeeded in identifying the trade monopoly with the welfare of the town. After the thirteenth century the merchant gilds were gradually transformed, sometimes merging their individuality in that of the municipal government, sometimes becoming religious fraternities, or otherwise losing their original character.

MUTUAL AID AND FORMAL RELIEF

These organizations were practically closed corporations. They maintained their trade monopoly to the exclusion of their fellow townsmen, and made admission to the gild exceedingly difficult. But for those who belonged to this inner circle, there was a close community of interest and a sharing of the daily experiences of life. The gild itself was just such a primary group, with intimate personal relations, as was the manor, which was discussed in the preceding chapter. This being the case, it is quite natural that we should find that the gilds assumed responsibility for the bereaved widows and orphans of their members, educated the latter, and if they were girls provided them with dowries. For the sick members they established special beds in the hospitals. Sometimes this was done in that simple unaffected way which we have described as mutual aid or neighborliness; sometimes when the group was larger and personal contacts less direct, somewhat more formal means were provided for the care of unfortunate members. For example, if a gildsman of Southampton were put into prison in any part of England, the alderman or steward

and others were required to go at the expense of the gild to procure his release. At Berwick "two or three of the gild were bound to labour on behalf of any other in danger of losing life or limb, though for only two days, at the gild's expense."

A society of merchants at Bristol, England, in 1445, provided for poor seamen within the old hospital of St. Bartholomew. Upon arrival in port, masters and mariners alike contributed to this institution, because "the wheche prest and pore peple may nott be founden ne sustayned withoute grete cost." The supporters of this institution really constituted a sort of benefit club, for members became eligible for admission only after paying their dues for seven years. In general, the relief work of the merchant gilds seems, like their other activities, to have been almost exclusively for the benefit of members. In the institution just cited the sailors were apparently regarded as a part of the gild system.

CRAFT GILDS

EXCLUSIVENESS AND COMMUNITY OF INTERESTS

This exclusiveness is still more apparent in the case of the "craft gilds," which had their rise during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The craft gild, instead of being a merchants' organization, was an association of all the artisans engaged in a particular industry in a particular town. The primary purpose seems to have been such supervision of the simple manufacturing as would secure the observance of generally accepted standards of good work. The artisans seem to have taken the initiative themselves, but were presently recognized by the towns and by the royal governments as the proper agency for controlling the making of goods. By the fifteenth century practically

every occupation that engaged a score of men came to have an organization of its own with regular meetings, elected officers, prescribed payments for common purposes, the right of search, certain powers of jurisdiction, common religious interests or practises, and a definite position in the civic constitution.

A number of things contributed to the development and preservation of a community spirit among the members of a craft gild. Early in the fourteenth century some of the English and German crafts had modest meeting places; and toward the end of that century they began to erect buildings for themselves, to which were sometimes added chapels and almshouses. The members of each craft usually lived on the same street, or at least in the same neighborhood, as is indicated by the street names of some of the older towns. They naturally attended the same parish church. They frequently organized religious fraternities. Also, the gilds exercised certain legal jurisdiction over their members, being frequently empowered to deal with petty disputes or breaches of craft regulations. All these things served to bind the members together into a well-knit community.

In the beginning the gilds were apparently quite democratic. Where a man employed others to work with him in his shop or house, their relations were of a family or patriarchal character. The workman usually lived with his employer, and shared in nearly all of his daily activities. Moreover, the hard working journeyman expected to be able in a few years to become an independent master, so that there was no social gulf between employer and employe.

But as time went on, this situation changed. Gild regulations made it increasingly difficult for journeymen to become masters. Indeed, any admission to the craft was

closely regulated by restriction upon apprenticeship. The various ordinances usually insisted upon an apprenticeship of at least seven years, and sometimes this was extended to eight, ten or twelve years. There was a limit upon the number of apprentices who might be taken by any one master, and large fees were charged for admission to apprenticeship, and later to the "fellowship of the mistery." In the course of the fourteenth century there began to appear a "laboring class" in the sense of men who were neither apprentices nor masters and who found it exceedingly difficult to set up in business for themselves.

In the beginning all members of the craft had been accustomed to wear some common token or costume, but before the end of the fifteenth century the "liveries" had become so expensive that only the wealthier members could afford them. Presently the "livery" became a superior grade to which the more substantial members were admitted as an honor, and upon the payment of heavy fees. In general the "livery" included most if not all of the employers. But there was an even more select body, known in England as the Court of Assistance, which, beginning as a sort of informal committee composed of the wealthier brethren in the "livery," became presently a limited and self-continuing council which was well-nigh absolute in the affairs of the society.

Over against the masters there grew up organizations of the journeymen, especially in Germany and France. They seem to have begun in the form of religious fraternities, and to have had at the outset the bitter opposition of the master craftsmen, who regarded it as an encroachment upon their position and an instrument for securing higher wages. The masters with the aid of civic authorities do not seem to have been able to suppress this movement, so after a time they changed their policy and

eventually managed to bring it under their own supervision. The journeymen they conciliated by permission to hold their own meetings, and the masters on their side were able to relieve themselves to some extent of the duty of providing for sick journeymen. These workingmen's organizations can hardly be regarded as the forerunners of of modern trade unions, because they were so completely overshadowed by the wealthier companies to which they were attached that they gradually lost all initiative and became a bit of mere formalism, which was finally abolished without any real loss to the journeymen.

On the whole, and particularly during their early history, the craft gilds constituted simple neighborhood organizations of people who shared their work, their living and their religious activities. And even in spite of the class divisions, which grew up in their midst, they retained a sense of solidarity over against members of other crafts and outsiders. Many municipal ordinances and royal orders were issued for the purpose of restricting people to the trade in which they had been apprenticed, and preventing the practise of any craft except by those who were duly authorized by the appropriate gild. This exclusiveness shows itself in the general limitation of relief-giving to the members of a given gild.

MUTUAL AID AND FORMAL RELIEF

As in the case of the merchant gilds, the care of the unfortunate seems to have gone forward very largely as a matter of simple neighborhood assistance. But with the growth in numbers and particularly with the division into the three social classes, it became a more formal matter. Thus we learn from the ordinances of a gild of white-tawyers, or leather dressers, in 1346, that they had a common box for subscriptions, out of which seven pence

a week were paid to any man of the trade who had fallen into poverty through old age or inability to work, and seven pence a week likewise to a poor man's widow so long as she remained unmarried. "If anyone of the said craft shall depart this life and have not wherewithal to be buried, he shall be buried at the expense of the common box, and when anyone of the said trade shall die, all those of the same trade shall go to the vigil and make offering on the morrow." Another clause orders that "those of the trade" shall aid a member who can not finish the work he has undertaken "so that the said work be not lost." At first there were no permanent funds for relief work, and when bequests were made, they were usually to be distributed at the funeral or upon the anniversary of the testator's death. But with the increase of the industrial and trading population, various gilds began to provide lodging for destitute members. Later with the help of legacies for that purpose, they erected almshouses or hospitals. Sometimes they would purchase the lands or buildings of some existing institution and use it for the care of their own members.

Thus, at Lynn, one of the ordinances of the town gild provided that relief should be given to any brother in poverty, either from the common fund or from the private purses of the gild brothers. A piece of land was bequeathed to the gild partly for the purpose of relieving the poor, and we are told thirty pounds a year was distributed to the poor brethren, to blind, lame and sick persons, and for other charitable purposes. We learn that the merchant tailors of Bristol secured permission "to purchase lands and tenements towards the maintenance of a chaplain to sing forever at the altar of Saint John Baptist, within the parish church of Saint Ewens," and that they had adopted the same plan "for the relief, succor and comfort of the

poor brethren and sistern of the same fraternity fallen in decay," who were assisted from the revenues of the lands and possessions " given by sundry persons " for that purpose. Thus the craft gilds made provision for their own unfortunate members. But there is exceedingly little evidence that they extended their philanthropy to outsiders. In other words, we have here primarily a case of mutual aid among those who belonged to these relatively simple groups, rather than charitable organizations. However, we have already observed the way in which the almost spontaneous neighborliness proved insufficient and came more and more to be supplemented by some formal and systematic means.

RELIGIOUS GILDS

A similar development may be traced in the religious fraternities with which the term gild came to be associated before the Reformation. Some of these were started as organizations of the journeymen, and quite as much for economic as for religious purposes. In France many of them were made up of peasants. But whatever other interests they may have had, these fraternities were primarily coöperative soul-saving associations. Their definite and avowed purpose seems to have been the securing of religious merit for their members; at first by candles and masses, then through mutual aid, and finally by alms to outsiders. Even their charitable activities were regarded as a definite part of the religious enterprise. The alms were given not merely for the purpose of relieving distress, but quite as much for the acquisition of spiritual benefits to the donors.

This emphasis upon the religious merit of almsgiving becomes still more apparent when we note the relation between the religious gilds and the chantries. Now the

chantry was usually established by the legacy of some person anxious to provide for his eternal welfare. Thus Sir John Fastolf, whose will is dated 1459, established "within the great mission at Castre, by him lately edified, a college of six religious men, monks, or secular priests, and six poor folk to pray for his soul and the souls of his wife, his father and mother, and others that he was beholden to in perpetuity."

To these chantries a small endowment was often attached for the provision of alms. Thus out of some twenty-five chantries in Bristol, the commissioners of Edward VI found that fourteen were spending a portion of their funds "in relief of the poor people yearly." It is interesting to note that about seven-eighths of the funds were paid to the "incumbent for his living in the service" and only one-eighth to the poor. The primary object of this endowed almsgiving was, of course, the same as that of the chantry. It was, namely, the good of the founder's soul. This is indicated in the regulations of Fastolf that his goods might be so faithfully distributed in "almsful deeds and charitable works that he might obtain the more hasty deliverance of his soul from the painful flames of the fire of Purgatory."

MUTUAL AID

Because of such facts as these Ashley has described these religious fraternities as "coöperative chantries." They were organizations to secure exactly the same ends as the chantries, but were created for the most part by people not sufficiently wealthy to establish foundations for their individual benefit.

Many of these brotherhoods did not profess to give any material relief at all. They limited their activities to the provision of altar lights, funeral masses, the services

of priests or pageants. But very frequently contributions were levied for particular cases of need, and in some instances poverty-stricken members were assigned a weekly pension. In a few isolated cases members were allowed to borrow from the common box enough to give them a fresh start in business.

Lallemand tells us that in almost all of the little cities and in the majority of the villages of southwestern France, there existed *confréries* and associations of mutual charity among the cultivators. These organizations seem to have included, along with the laborers and tenants, a certain number of bourgeois and ecclesiastics. The organization comprised two or three officers known as *majoraux*, one or two members charged with the convocations and visitors and caretakers for the sick.

It is worth while to observe that in the religious fraternity, as well as in the merchant and craft gilds, relief was given almost exclusively to members. In the beginning this was informal and unorganized, but later it took definite shape under the influence of the doctrine of the religious merit of almsgiving. Very slowly there was an expansion of this mutual aid into charities which benefited outsiders as well as those who belonged to the gilds. But in general, aid of detached individuals was provided either by the ecclesiastical institutions or governmental agencies.

SUGGESTED READINGS

d'Avenal, George: *Histoire économique de la propriété, des salaires, etc., 1200-1800.* Paris, 1894-1919, 6 vols.

Brentano, Lujo: *On the History and Development of Gilds and Origin of Trade Unions.* In Smith, J. T., English Gilds.

Ditchfield, P. H.: *The City Companies of London and Their Good Works;* a record of their history, charity and treasure. *London:* Dent, 1904.

Doren, Alfred: *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Kaufmannsgilden des Mittealters.* Leipzig: Duncker u. Humblot, 1893.

Gilbert, William: *The City: An Inquiry into the Corporation, its Livery Companies, and the Administration of Their Charities and Endowments.* London: Daldy Isbister, 1877.

Gross, Charles: *The Gild Merchant.* Oxford, 1890, 2 vols.

von Hegel, Karl: *Städte und Gilden der germanischen Völker im Mittelalter.* Leipzig: Duncker u. Humblot, 1891, 2 vols.

Hibbert, F. A.: *The Influence and Development of English Gilds.* Cambridge: *University Press,* 1891.

Levasseur, Emile: *Histoire des Classes Ouvrières et de l'Industrie en France avant 1789.* Vol. 2, Bk. 5.

Millett, F. B.: *Craft-Guilds of the Thirteenth Century in Paris.* Kingston: *Jackson Press,* 1915.

Renard, G. F.: *Guilds in the Middle Ages.* Trans. by D. Terry. London: Bell, 1919.

Unwin, Geo.: *The Gilds and Companies of London.* London: Methuen, 1909.

Waltzing, J. P.: *Les Corporations Romaines et la Charité.* Louvain, 1895.

CHAPTER XVIII

THE MEDIEVAL TOWNS

RISE OF THE TOWNS

It is hard for us of the twentieth century to realize how completely rural was the life of the middle ages. The old Roman towns had gradually decayed. The barbarians overran them and discouraged arts and crafts. The population that was not destroyed drifted away. In the age of feudalism there was little reason for the existence of towns. But with the increase of commerce, which as we have seen especially marked the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, more merchants travelled through the country. Frequently a town would spring up through the gathering of people for a market held by some noble who wanted to improve his estate. Very often this market or fair was held at some ford or crossroad. At first the merchants sold salt, fish and iron to the peasants. Or more likely they bartered them for the agricultural products. But as time went on, the variety of goods increased, foreign trade was developed, and small manufactures sprang up.

The towns developed first in Italy, which was probably least affected by the Germanic invasions. Moreover, Italy was conveniently located for the new trade which sprang up in connection with the Crusades. The Italian nobles were less interested in war than those of northern Europe and were more ready to put their surplus wealth into the new trading companies.

Originally, many of the towns had belonged to some nobleman's fief or manor and its inhabitants had been under much the same servile obligations to the lord as were the

rural serfs. But as the towns grew and increased in wealth they gradually secured privileges for themselves. They started off with a few necessary activities, such as maintaining the water supply, building a wall or keeping a river channel clear. Additional rights they bought from the nobles, kings or emperors, or secured them by fighting.

The French kings sporadically used the towns to offset the nobles. The nobles, in their turn, needed money and they, too, sold privileges to the towns. In Germany the towns were likewise a sort of foot-ball kicked back and forth between the emperor, on the one hand, and the nobility on the other. In England the central power, which had never broken down to the extent it had on the Continent, quite regularly favored the towns for financial reasons.

Many of these new towns were ruled by oligarchies of merchant princes. In fact, this seems to have been quite general in all of the countries of western Europe. In many places the members of the merchant gilds were the citizens of the towns. The machinery of the gild and of the municipal government frequently coalesced. In other cases the craft gilds were the more influential. But whichever it might be, it was only persons properly admitted to one of these bodies that could carry on any occupation within the city limits, or enjoy any of the rights and privileges of burghership. In many instances the town council itself was wholly, or partly, composed of the elected representatives of the gilds or companies.

With the further increase in wealth the "greater" companies came to exercise preponderating influence. For example, in London the mayor was exclusively chosen from one of the twelve "greater" companies, and many other privileges were enjoyed by these wealthy groups to the exclusion of some fifty "lesser" companies. Now

this preëminence in London was closely paralleled by the position of the Arti Maggiori in Florence, of the six Corps de Metiers in Paris, and of the Herrenzünfte in Basel.

Although less isolated than the manors, the earlier towns had a very limited range of contacts and were trading centers for very restricted areas. In England this was markedly true as late as the fifteenth century. As a consequence we find that the towns were in their way just as exclusive as were the gilds. However many distinctions there might be between the inhabitants of the town, they all were united in opposition to outsiders. Thus, in England, we find a petition from the merchants of Southampton that certain restrictions be placed upon merchants coming to the town from Winchester or Salisbury. The word foreigner was applied not only to those of other countries, but indeed to anyone who did not belong in the town.

Not only did the opposition to the outsiders serve to bind the townsmen together, but certain common activities contributed to the development of a community spirit. The towns frequently maintained market houses and market stalls. Some of them had acquired control of the manorial mills; in some places there were municipal ovens or bake-houses; and quite generally there were common pastures for the cattle of the citizens. Admittedly these new medieval towns were far from democratic, but they did create a frame-work for a larger social organization than would ever have been possible under feudalism. The manors, and even the gilds, were practically limited in scope to groups of people who came daily face to face with one another. But the town was a more complex and a larger unit. It brought together for business purposes groups of people who otherwise might have exceedingly little to do with one another. Nevertheless, the early

towns were themselves small enough so that there could grow up a certain community of interest and a group life, less intimate and personal than in the manors and within the individual gilds of the town, but on the other hand more comprehensive and extensive.

REPRESSION OF BEGGING

As in the case of the nation, so with the towns, one of the earliest official activities with reference to the poor was the attempt to repress begging.

A London Proclamation of 1359 declared that vagabonds "do waste divers alms which would otherwise be given to many poor folks, such as lepers, blind, halt and persons oppressed with old age and divers other maladies." This Proclamation ordered them to leave the city at once on pain of being put into the stocks. In 1375 it was ordered that "no one who by handicraft or the labor of his body can earn his living shall counterfeit the begging poor," that is, the impotent.

In Geneva false poor abounded. So in 1458 the "chapitre," during a vacancy of the episcopal chair, at the request of the trustees (syndics) and councillors of the city, addressed to the people a most judicious charge, which said in effect:

"Among the works which divine precepts impose upon all of the faithful, helping the poor and meeting their needs with the goods which you have received is by no means the least. Unhappily there are in the crowd of beggars which pour into Geneva from all Christendom some who feign various diseases, and others who claim to be without resources when they are not. They carry with them the seeds of contagious diseases.

"Our intention is not to turn people from giving

alms. But it is not enough simply to do this good deed; it must be done advisedly (à propos).

"This multitude of the poor and their frequent concourse must be restrained in order that no harm may result. We exhort everyboody to practise a discrete piety, and we order that none of the indigent who encumber the city, whether really unfortunate or rogues, shall receive any hospitality except in one of the seven hospitals of Geneva. We forbid any citizen to take them in. We charge all the rectors and governors of these asylums, under penalty of excommunication and fine of sixty shillings, to see to it that these false poor who present themselves do not hide any evil practises under the appearance of poverty and misery. The really needy must be cared for with mercy.

"The rectors have the duty of informing the various civil authorities of mendicants who lead a disreputable life, especially if they are ribald fellows, gamblers, spies or sturdy rogues."

In the reform measures introduced by the city council in 1525, at Zürich, under the advice of Zwingli we trace the influence both of the new ecclesiastical movement and of the tendency of the civil governments to extend their functions. Every kind of begging was strictly prohibited. Poor strangers might pass through the town, but they must nowhere beg. They would be given a bowl of soup and a piece of bread, and must then pass on. Only the sick and enfeebled should receive permanent support, either in special institutions or by food given in their own homes, and their cases should be investigated by the pastor and a pious layman.

So also in the regulation of a "common chest" which was drawn up by Luther in 1523, it was set forth that "begging is to be rigidly prohibited. All who are not old and weak shall work. No beggars are to be permitted

to stay who do not belong to the parish." This seems to have influenced many of the German cities. Augsburg had already begun with the prohibition of street begging. It was followed by Nürnberg and Breslau in 1523, Ratisbon and Magdeburg in 1524.

The people of Southampton, England, hit upon the novel device of employing the barbers to frighten away the beggars, and in 1527 paid four pence to four barbers " for cuttyng of vacabundes here short."

In full accord with their economic exclusiveness, most of the towns not only sought to be rid of vagabonds from other places, but accorded special privileges to their own citizens. In some cases these took the form of licensing certain people to beg. Thus Southampton had, in 1529, as many as sixty-four liveries for its beggars. About 1540 a " comptroller " or " master of beggars " is mentioned with a silver gilt badge instead of a tin one, and a small annual fee. That a similar arrangement existed in York appears in an ordinance in 1583 that "from henceforth no head beggars shall be chosen," and that " from Christmas the four present head beggars shall not have any wages or clothing of the common chamber, but only their weekly stipends gathered of the many assistants for the relief of the poor."

Certain charitable establishments in Lille had residents who from time immemorial had enjoyed the right to beg within the city limits. They were required to wear on their breast a white cross " two fingers wide and a foot long." This regulation was renewed by the échevins or aldermen as late as 1411.

Similar to the repression of begging was the legislation directed toward the control of lepers. The Assizes of London had proclaimed, in 1276, that " no leper shall be in the city, nor come and make any stay there." The

"Customs of Bristol," written down by the recorder in 1344 declare "that no leper reside within the precincts of the town." So far we have mere exclusion, without definite efforts to provide for the lepers. But that constructive philanthropy was not always lacking is indicated by the measures of the burgesses of Berwick-on-Tweed. "No leper shall come within the gates of the borough; and if one gets in by chance, the sergeant shall put him out at once. If one wilfully forces his way in, his clothes shall be taken off him and burnt, and he shall be turned out naked. For we have aready taken care that a proper place for lepers shall be kept up outside the town, and that alms shall be there given to them." Similar regulations were adopted by the various towns on the Continent.

POSITIVE RELIEF MEASURES

PROVISION OF GRAIN DURING FAMINE

A different sort of activity for the control of poverty and misery was the supplying of grain in time of famine. Adam Bamme, Lord Mayor of London in 1391, "in a great dearth procured corn from parts beyond the seas to be brought hither in such abundance as sufficed to serve the city and the counties near adjoining; to the furtherance of which good work he took out of the orphans' chest in the guildhall two thousand marks to buy the said corn, and each alderman laid out twenty pounds to the like purpose." This same expedient was adopted again in London in 1438 by the mayor of that time, Sir Stephen Brown, who "charitably relieved the oldest of poor citizens by sending ships at his own expense to Danzig, which returned laden with rye, and which seasonable supply soon sank grain to reasonable rates." Somewhat later, an ex-mayor built a municipal granary, which was maintained by voluntary contributions. Until nearly the

middle of the sixteenth century purchases seem to have been made only in years of exceptional dearness. But in 1565 annual purchases were ordered. A similar provision was made in many other English towns.

This same step was taken by all the more populous towns of Germany; for example, by Nürnberg, Augsburg, Breslau, Strassburg and Frankfurt. The emperor, Charles V, when he visited Nürnberg in 1540, is said to have tasted bread made of wheat which had been preserved in the municipal granary one hundred and eighteen years.

TAKING OVER HOSPITALS

The manner in which the gilds paved the way for municipal charities appears in the taking over by the towns of the administration of hospitals and almshouses. Sometimes this appears to have been at the invitation of the management and sometimes it was done more or less arbitrarily.

One of the first steps toward municipal control of charities was the making burgesses trustees of private hospitals. This happened in Exeter, Northampton, Nottingham, Wallingford, Rochester, Croydon and other towns in England.

"At Bridgeport (1265) the town administered the endowment of the manorial lord; the provosts conducted a yearly investigation whether the brethren and lepers were well treated and the chaplains lived honestly. In London there were officials who daily inspected the lazar houses; these 'overseers' and 'foremen' seem to have been busy citizens who undertook this work on behalf of the corporation. (1389)."

At Sandwich the burgesses controlled the two hospitals dedicated respectively to St. Bartholomew and St. John. Both were virtually almshouses providing for a certain

number of old people. The mayor and jurats of Sandwich not only appointed the governors of St. Bartholomew's but audited the accounts, controlled the management and appointed new recipients of the charity. The whole was connected with an annual festal procession to the hospital in which many of the townsfolk took part.

"At Scarborough Henry de Bulmer gave a site for St. Thomas' hospital which was furnished and endowed by the burgesses. (The burgesses of Scarborough are said to have founded and maintained another hospital, dedicated to St. Nicholas, and in which both poor men and women were maintained.) At Chester the town gave land on condition that certain almshouses were built, and Ipswich in 1469 granted the profits of St. James' fair to the lazars."

The same process went on in France, Italy and Germany. The governors of the Hospital of Mirecourt were named by the General Assembly of the community in the fifteenth century. The Hospital of St. Eleuthère, at Tournai, was placed under the direction of a master appointed by the City Council. At Lille the magistrate chose the overseers of certain charitable institutions and the aldermen at Ypres had almost complete power over the various asylums.

On the Continent we find evidence not only of the municipalities taking over hospitals and almshouses but actually founding them. Thus Venice in 1474 established an institution known as the "Spedale di Messer Gesu Christo" to celebrate a victory over the Turks. As early as the twelfth century the Asylum of Saints Peter and Paul devoted to the care of Pilgrims to the Holy Land, was ruled by a committee of the Council of Ten under the supervision of the Doge. The principal hospital of Cremona, Italy, was from its founding under the direction

of six citizens, known as Regents. The City Council of Augsburg named three curators for the Hospital of St. James in the fourteenth century.

In addition to taking over more or less complete control of existing institutions, the cities undertook the management of new institutions, founded by philanthropic citizens. Thus a hospital in La Rochelle was, by the will of its founder, managed by a layman, who was appointed by a council composed of the mayor and ten prud-hommes. Two brothers established a charitable institution at Romans. They provided that it should be under the direction of their heirs, but that at the extinction of their family it should be taken in charge by two consuls of the city. A citizen of Tournai and his wife founded the Asylum of St. John the Baptist in 1493, and administered it themselves. Their son was to take their place, and after him the control passed to the provost and mayor. In Ypres, Margarite Voet managed a hospital during her life, and at her death left it in charge of the aldermen.

A case of forceable assumption of the responsibility for hospitals occurred in Venice in 1450 when the Duke Alexander de Medici insisted that the welfare of the Republic required that important establishments like Lo Spedale Di Santa Maria Nuova should be taken over by the state. He therefore appointed certain noblemen as inspectors to investigate the conduct of these institutions and audit their accounts.

OUTDOOR RELIEF

Along with hospital care the towns came also to provide for various sorts of outrelief. Sometimes it was given for a definite purpose and sometimes it was the same old indiscriminate almsgiving. Progress is marked by increase in the former, and gradual elimination of the latter.

At Lydd sums were given for "Goderynges dowghetyr, pour mayde, for hosyne, shoys and other thyngses." On several occasions payments were made for her clothes and keep. In 1482–3, 3s. 4d. was paid to Thomas Maykyne "to kepe Goderyng's doughtyr," and in 1485 there is another entry of the same kind: "Paid for a kertylcloth for Herry Goderyng's doughtyr and for making thereof, 3s. 1d." In this town, also, gifts of corn were regularly distributed at Easter and Christmas from 1439 onwards.

As early as the fourteenth century in Southampton forfeits and alms were awarded to the poor. In the fifteenth century "the towyns almys were settled on a plan" and lists were kept of the weekly payments. The steward's book of 1441 states that the town gave weekly to the poor 4 pounds 2s. 1d., which according to the value of money at that time might have furnished relief for about a hundred and fifty people.

In France the communes did rather little for the poor before the sixteenth century. Nevertheless, we find accounts of some allowances to the poor and some endowments administered by the municipalities. Thus at Limoges a charitable fund provided from very old ground rents was handled by the city. Moreover, the consuls of Limoges had the right to maintain a charity box or treasury which was kept by voluntary gifts, legacies and even a tax upon the citizens. At Niort distributions of bread on the third of May, known as *charité de la blée,* were administered by the Mayor and the magistrates in the fourteenth century. The magistrates of Douai instituted a community alms in 1317, and named five citizens to receive and distribute gifts for the unfortunate. Municipal outrelief also appears in Italy. Thus the city officials of Genoa in 1413 appointed some "upright citizens," known as

officiales misericordiae, on whom they laid the duty of appealing for and distributing offerings for the indigent.

One of the most interesting of all the systems of municipal charities developed at the beginning of the modern era was that established at Ypres, in Flanders, about 1525, under the influence of a Spaniard, Juan Louis Vivès. It seems that the magistrates of Bruges had applied to Vivès for advice about the care of their poor. In response he wrote a treatise on the Relief of the Poor (de subventione pauperum). He began by impressing the public authorities that it was their duty to see that the destitute were properly provided for. He then proceeded to sketch a new poor law, taking as its basis a division of the destitute into three classes: (1) those sheltered in hospitals and almshouses; (2) homeless beggars and (3) the honest and shame-faced poor abiding in their own houses. He went on to insist on the importance of an accurate census of the needy. He insisted upon two guiding principles; all who were able should be counseled to work, and begging should be absolutely forbidden. For those who were unable to work a refuge should be provided in hospitals and almshouses.

Whether Bruges adopted Vivès' scheme or not, we are not told, but the city of Ypres did undertake to put the plan into operation. Begging was absolutely forbidden and efforts were made to find work for all who were capable of it. The administration of relief was centralized and placed under four superintendents who were assisted in each parish by four persons specially assigned to this work. A census of the destitute was taken and an effort made to reform the hospitals. For financial support, Vivès' suggestion was followed and the city depended on volun-

tary donations, stimulated by the exhortations of the clergy.

News of this innovation seems to have spread quite rapidly, and applications began to pour in upon the Ypres authorities for copies of their regulations. Vivès' little book was soon translated into Spanish, Italian and French. However, not everyone received it favorably. The four mendicant orders and some of the clergy attacked the rules adopted by Ypres on the ground that they interfered with the practise of the Christian virtue of charity. In 1531 a copy of the rules was sent to the Sorbonne for judgment, and while the decision was mainly on the side of the reform, a proviso was added which encouraged private almsgiving, and thus weakened the whole thing. Charles V secured a copy of the rules and tried to put them into effect in Spain, but his power was inadequate to enforce the regulation. Moreover, he authorized the local officials to give a selected number of the impotent poor badges authorizing them to beg.

LIMITATIONS OF MUNICIPAL CHARITIES

We have seen that the charities of the manor, the parish and the gild grew out of simple neighborhood assistance and never entirely expanded beyond a form of mutual aid. The growth of the towns provided a framework within which social relations could be extended, and which consequently provided relief for a more heterogeneous lot of needy folk. But the towns, like the smaller groups, were pretty exclusive during the middle ages.

In her account of medieval hospitals in England Miss Clay tells us that "Freemen had an advantage, if not a monopoly, when seeking entrance into houses under

municipal supervision. The 'Customals' of Rye and Winchelsea show that men and women, 'who have been in good love and fame all their time, and have neither goods nor chattels whereof to live,' were received without payment into the hospitals of the town. Bubwith's almshouse, Wells, was to receive men so poor that they could not live except by begging, and so decrepit that they were unable to beg from door to door. Reduced burgesses were assigned 'the more honorable places and beds.' At St. Ursula's, Chester, candidates were preferred who had been one of the 'twenty-four,' or the widows of aldermen and common councilmen. . . . . St. John's Bedford, was intended only for townsmen; all such applying to the master for relief were to be received; but all 'poore folkes dwelling without the same town to be expulsed and put out.' . . . . . Davy of Croydon put his almshouse under the vicar and other townsmen, answerable ultimately to the Mercers' company, and provided that his pensioners should be 'householders or trewe labourers' from within four miles, preference being given to residents of long standing, if of good character and destitute."

This exclusiveness rested upon a limitation which is peculiar to any local body. No town could accept the task of caring for all needy persons who happened within its borders. It would soon be overrun by applicants for help. So long as the population was attached to the soil, as was usual in the early middle ages, the local community was able to handle the situation. But with the increasing mobility of the population which went hand in hand with the growth of the towns, it became more and more necessary that the state should take some action, and we have already seen how the English Poor Law developed out of just this situation.

SUGGESTED READINGS

Ashley, W. J.: *An Introduction to English Economic History.* London: Longmans Green, 1893, 2 vols.

Abram, A.: *Social England in the Fifteenth Century.* London: Routledge, 1909.

Green, Mrs. J. R.: *Town Life in the Fifteenth Century.* London: Macmillan, 1894.

von Hegel, Karl: *Die Entstehung des deutschen Städtewesens.* Leipzig: Hirzel, 1898.

von Hegel, Karl: *Geschichte der Städteverfassung von Italien seit der Zeit der römischen Herrschaft bis zum Ausgang des zwölften Jahrhunderts.* Leipzig: Weidmann, 1847.

Unwin, Geo.: *Industrial Organization in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1904.

Vivès, Juan Louis: *De Subventione Pauperum.* Translation published by the New York School of Social Work.

English Towns and Gilds. University of Pennsylvania Translations and Reprints. Vol. 2, No. 1.

Medieval Towns; a series of books published by J. M. Dent & Co., London, including the stories of Avignon, Bruges, Canterbury, Chartres, Dublin, Edinburgh, Florence, Lucca, Nürnberg, Prague, Seville, Toledo and others. Various authors.

See also readings for Chapter XVII.

CHAPTER XIX

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

We have about reached the end of our story. Beginning with the social work as we see it to-day, we have attempted to trace its origins back through the nineteenth century humanitarianism and the public relief systems, ecclesiastical charities and the mutual aid of medieval groups. We have endeavored to find the causes for the changing forms of social work, together with the achievements and the mistakes of each age.

Social work of the present seems to be in the process of becoming a profession, resting more and more on a scientific basis, giving increased attention to preventive and constructive work, and gradually welding scattered activities into a coherent system of public service. From the middle class humanitarians of the nineteenth century it has received financial backing for making experiments; it has learned principles of organization and administration; it has acquired techniques for dealing with a variety of practical problems. From the development of the English Poor Law it has inherited the idea of national responsibility for the problems of poverty and the notion that charity as such will never solve them. The teachings of the Church, exemplified in its myriads of charities, have given the greatest single stimulus to attend to the needs of one's fellow men. The mutual aid of simple neighborhood groups in the middle ages is a standing challenge to make social work more personal and human.

But the mutual aid of the medieval manor and gild

rested upon isolation and fixity, both geographical and social. Its relative sufficiency was due to the absence of specialized occupations. It could never meet the needs of a mobile population nor take the place of modern professional service. The Church's doctrine of the religious merit of almsgiving was fundamentally selfish and drew attention away from the needs of the unfortunate to the spiritual hopes of the favored. It dealt almost exclusively with the suffering that was obvious and made little effort to find and eliminate the causes. The public relief systems have tended to fall into routine and formality, due very often to the injection of partisan politics. The nineteenth century humanitarianism has been a curious mixture of maudlin sentimentality, business methods and efforts to keep the laboring people contented with their lot. On the whole, it has stood for patronage rather than justice, for "charity" rather than democracy. Social work of the twentieth century has inherited all these handicaps along with the positive achievements of the past.

A BASIS OF INTERPRETATION

Rather than merely repeat what has gone before, we are going to undertake an interpretation, using the language of the social psychologists, particularly Professor Mead and Professor Cooley. The following summary of this point of view may at first seem to be an unwarranted digression, but its pertinence will presently appear.

We have been studying the sort of behavior that is usually described as social work, philanthropy, charity, welfare work, etc. The acts involved in solving problems of social and economic maladjustment offer no evidence of being fundamentally different from other activities of normal human beings. We shall therefore make our

approach through a (we hope not very inaccurate) description of any act.

The act, as such, involves stimulation and response. But that is not all. There is something in us which predisposes us to respond to certain stimuli at certain times. For example, the sight of food does not of itself create the response involved in going after it and eating it. But if we are hungry, we are predisposed to see food objects and in a way prepared to perform the movements necessary to secure them. To use the words of some of the psychologists, visual, olfactory and other sense imagery find us sensitive to this particular kind of stimulus and motor imagery facilitates the response.

But there is something back of the fact of being hungry. Our basic predispositions we call instincts. There is a good deal of debate about the nature of instincts, but whatever they are, they make possible the experiences characteristic of our species. And among our various actions the most successful ones tend to be selected and become established more or less permanently as habits. When any activity becomes habitual we cease to notice it, we say that it takes care of itself. But if it should be disturbed, we would have to give it our attention. If the new factors persist, we have to reorganize our habit.

Now it is the interference with our instinctive, habitual or reflex activities that creates our problems and makes us think. Because the situation is new, we are at a loss as to how to proceed. We start to do this, that and the other thing, that seems as though it might do. But these conflicting tendencies may appear simultaneously or in such rapid succession as to inhibit each other and keep us for the moment from doing anything. It is this checking of our response that compels and makes possible reflective thinking.

So far as physical objects are concerned, we can usually go ahead without thinking. We are not aware of the various processes involved in walking, unless something unusual occurs. The reason for this is the fact that physical objects concerned in our walking are relatively stable; ordinarily they do not change in any way that affects our conduct. But social objects are continually changing. People do not stay put, nor can we always count on their behaving in definite fixed ways. Moreover, they change in response to what we do. We cannot as social scientists study people in the way that biologists study bugs. The insect can be examined without being aware of the presence of the student. But the man changes while the investigation is going on, and because it is going on.

Hence it seems fair to make a distinction between what we may call physical acts and social acts. When two animals or persons approach each other, each is on the alert for signs of what the other is going to do. Suppose that A's attitude indicates that he is dangerous. B may respond with a show of fight or with flight. Whichever it is, A's attitude toward B will change, because B himself has changed; whereupon B will make a different response to the altered A, and so the parrying will go on. One of the most characteristic examples of this, which Professor Mead calls a "conversation of gestures," is the boxing match.

In social conduct, as we have described it, attention may be centered upon the incipient acts of the other, without our being definitely aware of their significance. Consciousness of meaning seems to come only from awareness of our own response. Now such gestures as are involved in bodily attitudes or expressions of the countenance we are

not ordinarily aware of in ourselves. But we are aware of pantomimic and especially of "vocal gestures." If we shake our fist, we see ourselves do it; if we speak, we hear ourselves. Thus we become aware of what we are doing.

In using gestures or words and in being aware of them we in a sense respond to them. Being conscious of what we are doing or saying to some one else, we are in the position of the other person watching or listening to us. We are putting ourselves in his place. We are aware of the effect of our act upon him, and see ourselves from his point of view. It is thus that we "see ourselves as others see us."

Of course, the extent to which we can really take the rôle of another depends upon the extent to which there are similar or identical impulses in both parties. But apparently there are a good many impulses common to most human beings. Hence it seems to be through the play back and forth, the parrying, the "conversation of gestures," that we acquire the imagery whereby we can assume the rôles which others are taking or have taken in the past. We are not confined to the present, for we have something that we call memory.

But memory is not all. We not only recall past experiences, but carry the process farther, on the basis of present stimulations, and wonder how the other person would act or what he would say under given conditions. We find ourselves carrying on an imaginary conversation, taking now the part associated with "I" and now the part of the other, (imaginatively) standing in his shoes, assuming his attitude and speaking for him.

It seems to be in some such manner as this that we

get acquainted with people, and, moreover, that we get acquainted with ourselves; that is, become self-conscious. It is in taking the rôle of another that we set ourselves up as an object. It is thus that we enter into the life of our community. Now there is nothing mysterious or esoteric about this. We have only to watch a child at his play to hear him carrying on imaginary conversations, taking now one part and now another, playing a variety of parts.

In what the social psychologists call a "primary group," every member enters more or less completely into the life of every other member. Having constant dealings with one another in all the activities of life, they acquire the imagery to assume each other's rôles. They can put themselves into each other's places, and this makes possible real sympathy. That does not mean that all the members of the group must be alike. In fact the opposite seems to be nearer the truth, for if all individuals were alike, the distinction between me and thee might never come to consciousness. On the other hand, if differences were too great, these intimate relations would be impossible. Within the primary group differences are sufficient to attract attention, but not so great as to prevent mutual understanding.

It is in these primary groups where everybody knows everybody else intimately that "social control" develops. Putting himself now in the place of this one, now of that one, and finding everywhere an essential agreement of attitude toward himself, he is very likely to do and become that which is expected of him. Primitive society, in particular, seems to be marked by the fixity of belief and custom, so that there is little opportunity for the exercise of individual initiative. One striking out along a new line

would promptly feel the censure of the entire group, and being unsupported in his opposition would normally return to the established ways. If he could appeal to some outsider for justification and support he might become an innovator, but the exclusiveness and isolation of the primitive group prevented this. The people whose opinion and attitude one regarded were none others than the people who made up his group.

What then of the outsider, the barbarian, the gentile, the foreigner, the "unwashed?" In the first instance the primary group has no dealings with him except as an enemy. He is different. He has been brought up in a different environment, and has formed different habits. The members of our group have not the imagery with which to put themselves in his place. Hence impulses of fear or hostility are not inhibited by other impulses, as within the group. Social control is removed, and action is immediate and hostile. This warlike attitude is strengthened and perpetuated by perception of the fact that the other members of our group are acting in a similar manner. We find self-approval in group approval. We identify ourselves with the group, and thereby greatly enhance our feeling of self-importance. This enlarged self-feeling together with "taking off the lid" produces an exhilaration which carries this hostility along in an invincible manner.

How then does a group ever enlarge itself? How do we ever come to have any attitude other than unrestrained hostility toward the outsider. The first means seems to have been created by the institution of slavery, through a combination of the ideas and impulses connected with property and belligerency. In the primitive group property did not involve exclusiveness except in such articles as

the spear or club; nearly everything was the property of the group. Or, perhaps we should say, there was property only in things under immediate personal control (depending upon the definition of property). But when a community developed an economic process (herding of flocks or crude agriculture) in which there was a possible function for a slave, they stopped killing all their enemies and put some of them to work. Thus the limited exclusiveness involved in property was extended from weapons to human beings, and the hostile attitude was inhibited by economic impulses.

A new relationship had been brought into existence. By means of it the group could be enlarged indefinitely and anyone could be brought in. But the slave was not a full member of the group. The attitude of hostility had been mitigated, not abolished. The warlike and the acquisitive impulses had combined to produce what we call "an abstract relation." It was abstract because one aspect of life had been taken out of its setting, abstracted from all the rest. Master and slave did not have to consider any except the property relation. That the slave was a husband, father, brother, neighbor, etc., meant nothing at all to his master. To the slave the master was merely a wielder of the whip, the one who fed him and used him as a domestic animal.

THE EVOLUTION OF SOCIAL WORK

All this may seem a far cry from the history of social work, but its significance will presently appear. In the middle ages nearly everybody lived in a small, isolated, exclusive, self-sufficient group, often at war with its neighbors, but otherwise ignoring the existence of a

world beyond. Within the manor, parish, merchant or craft gild, or religious fraternity, everybody knew everybody else, or at least readily understood all those with whom he had dealings. The intimate personal relations made these veritable primary groups. As we have seen, there was not always unity and harmony, but in general there tended to be inner solidarity. In cases of misfortune due to illness, flood, fire, famine, etc., they helped one another as sympathy directed and without formality. But with the increase in numbers, the division into cliques and other aspects of the break-down of concrete personal relations, it became necessary to organize definite means for meeting the various exigencies of life. And poverty, disease and death were regarded and treated in the main as group calamities, not as individual misfortunes.

On the other hand, there were always individuals who had lost their immediate connection with the home community. They went on pilgrimages, ran away from their lords, or became traveling merchants. These detached individuals were looked upon with suspicion, and there was a constant effort to attach them to some local group. But during the Crusades their numbers became so great that this effort was bound to be unsuccessful. From that time on to the final break-up of feudalism the numbers of pilgrims, beggars, thieves, merchants and other wanderers increased with great rapidity.

What then was the attitude of those who "stayed put" toward the detached folk? In the first place, it was still one of exclusiveness and hostility and manifested itself in the many attempts to repress begging. But the numbers and the persistence of the "vagabonds" and

beggars were so great that failure was a foregone conclusion. Something else had to be done.

One of the most interesting stages of the entire history of social work is that in which the aid given to members of primary groups was gradually extended to outsiders. How was this done? What was the technique? What was the function which the strangers might perform so as to secure at least partial admission to the group life? It was all involved in the doctrine of the religious merit of almsgiving. By giving alms to the poor, helpless and wandering folk the donors hoped to secure eternal salvation. Not only did the beggars help to make eternal bliss certain by accepting the gifts of respectable folk, they also offered prayers for their benefactors which were supposed to be efficacious in saving the soul from Hell and shortening its stay in Purgatory. Hence medieval almsgiving was not merely charity; it was an exchange of services. Bread, clothing and shelter were traded for prayers and credits in the heavenly ledger. The whole thing was very much like a commercial transaction. It was an economic function that made possible the extension of relief to those who did not belong to one's own group.

This doctrine of the religious merit of almsgiving was not a new thing. Just when it first appeared is not certain, but there is some reason to believe that it took shape during the Babylonian captivity of the ancient Hebrews. It seems that some of the Jews showed a tendency to seek favor among their masters, neglecting their fellow countrymen. The appeal to the fear of Jehovah was part of a program to preserve the national pride and group spirit of the transported people. This doctrine which almost certainly grew out of the break-down of primary group relations was perpetuated by the Christian Church for

similar reasons. So long as the Church consisted of a relatively small number of people who had a great deal in common, little was said about divine favor as a reward of charity. The early Church was essentially a primary group. But dissensions between those who spoke Aramaic and those whose language was Greek gave rise to the appointment of deacons to look out for those in need. With the further growth in numbers and heterogeneity, it was found desirable to emphasize the idea that God rewards the benevolent, and this teaching appears over and over again in the writings of the Church Fathers.

With the "Fall of Rome" and still more with the break-up of Charlemagne's Empire, European society became decentralized and came to consist, as we have already seen, of many small, (and independent except for feudal formalities) groups. It was the influence of the Church that was largely responsible for changing this situation. The belief that bodily healing and religious merit were to be gained through visiting holy shrines and through helping to rescue the Holy Land from the infidels set large bodies of men in motion and detached thousands from their primary groups. It was from this time on to the Reformation that the doctrine of the religious merit of almsgiving attained greatest prominence.

The abstractness of the relations between the givers and the recipients of alms must be apparent. The central problem was not even the relief of the indigent, much less enabling them to assume a normal position in society, but the salvation of the donors. The established folk saw in the wanderers means of divine grace for themselves. The unfortunate and the needy were regarded as an asset! It was not necessary to put themselves in the places of the poor, unless to see how many Paternosters and Ave Marias

they would offer in return for a given donation. On the other hand, the beggars saw in the rich simply possible sources of food and clothing. On neither side was there recognition of human personality in its richness and fullness. The mental image was a highly refined abstraction rather than a recognition of man as man.

Even more important than the abstractness of the relations is the fact that social relations were being extended. In this development the religious merit of almsgiving was only one of several factors. Probably far more important was the growth of commerce which was stimulated by the crusades. The exchange of goods required trips by land and sea and the establishment of trading centres. So towns, which had been well-nigh non-existent during the earlier middle ages began to spring up. With increased commerce came the manufacture of goods for exchange. As a consequence the towns became larger and acquired a more heterogeneous population. Thus there was being built up a new social framework, much more extensive than any medieval group, but with social relations more attenuated and abstract. The townspeople had certain things in common, but many aspects of life they did not share. It was primarily business relations with which they were concerned.

But they did take some account of each other as human beings and undertook to look out for each other by means that became more and more organized. The early municipal charities were more personal than the indiscriminate almsgiving that preceded and accompanied them; at the same time they were less personal than the mutual aid of simpler groups. This is what we might expect, for the whole life of these new social structures was made up of more intimate relations than those between members of a

group and outsiders, but it was less personal than the relations between members of smaller groups where there was much greater community of interest.

But the towns themselves were exclusive and looked out for their own citizens chiefly, if not solely. It was the development of the modern nations from the sixteenth century onward that created a still more extensive, even if more attenuated social order. Just as the towns could not long be sufficient unto themselves commercially and industrially, neither could they alone solve the problems of poverty. It remained for the nations to undertake those measures made necessary by increasing mobility.

This same process has been carried still farther by the Industrial Revolution. The development of large-scale industry, the division of labor and the simplification of individual tasks have made it possible for the worker to find a place in almost any industrial community. The size of the establishments, the lack of personal contacts between employers and employes, the displacement of names by numbers, and the impersonal character of the pay envelope mean still further removal from the situation in which relations between men are intimate and concrete.

The tremendous growth of cities in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and the improved means of transportation have also contributed greatly to the mobility and anonymity of modern life. Concrete relations may be preserved, but they constitute a smaller and smaller proportion of those in which our life consists. Hence we seem to be getting farther and farther away from the simple group organization of the middle ages where there was poverty but not pauperism, mutual aid but not charity.

The humanitarian movements of the nineteenth century represent in one aspect an attempt to overcome the growing

abstractness of social relations, but in their original form they were bound to fail, for charity as such always involves an abstraction. The poor cannot enter completely into the group life, because the best of relief does not remove the causes of destitution. Moreover, there is the consciousness of a gift from the successful and the provident to those unable to care for themselves. Whether the gift be from an individual or from the community—and the latter is certainly more democratic than the former—it implies a distinction between the capable and the inferior. Not charity, but social insurance, free compulsory education, and all those things that will go to make complete political and industrial democracy, can break down class lines and give everyone an equal part in our common life.

Charity thus means a second sort of abstraction. It implies that something is wrong with the political and industrial system. It indicates the recognition of the lack of a completely human situation. But it means an acceptance of the existing economic arrangements, with an effort to attain more intimate relations outside of the economic phase of activity. The employer, charity organization society, or nation which strives to relieve poverty and misery without going into the economic and other causes is unconsciously or deliberately separating one aspect of life from another. He or it is literally performing an abstraction. He is considering one phase of the social process without reference to the whole of which it is a part.

Some social workers are trying to revive simple group life by organizing city blocks, neighborhoods, communities, etc. But it is clear that we can never go back to anything like the simplicity, intimacy and local solidarity of the medieval world. Even if we could, we should

probably lose more than we should gain. By its mobility, anonymity and individualism the modern world has divided up its work so that each of us is dependent upon the specialized services of a multitude of trades and professions. Through these we have achieved higher standards of living and we would not lightly cast them aside.

But an acceptance of larger and larger groups with their necessarily attenuated and more or less abstract relations as circles of truly human coöperation; with each one's primary group a unique but not exclusive thing; and with every member of the larger group a potential member of the primary group involves the establishment of a profession to render specific services without reference to the division of men into little groups. Social work to-day cannot be mutual aid within primary groups, for such groups in the sense of limited, isolated and exclusive communities have ceased to bound our essential relationships. As the charity of one group extended to another, or of a group to detached individuals, it is out of harmony with the democratic spirit of the age, and seems certain to fail because of the reaction against it. As professional public service available to everybody it will have an important place in the twentieth century.

Just because of the complexity of modern civilization, we are not likely to see the day when everyone will be completely and harmoniously adjusted in his social relations. As far ahead as we can see there will be people whose family relations will break down, people who do not get on with their fellow workmen, people who misunderstand and are misunderstood by their neighbors, people who need to break with old associates and to form new friends, and others who too greatly subordinate the com-

mon welfare to the gain of themselves, their families or cliques. To help such folk find, revise, or restore their place in society is the distinctive task of the social worker. It is just as dignified and just as important as the work of the lawyer whose function is the adjustment of formal, legal relations, or of the physician who attends to our physical needs. It is not merely, nor chiefly, the failure of charity that calls for this new type of social work. It is the demands of democracy and of science that make it imperative that social work achieve professional standing. And social work, as distinguished from general civic activity, will become a profession, worthy of a place in the twentieth century, when it is performed by democratically organized groups of scientifically trained specialists whose skilled services are at the disposal of democratically organized communities and states.

INDEX

Addams, Jane, 134
Almsgiving, 167–8, 215, 221 ff., 237
Amalgamation of social agencies, 45–8
American Association for Organizing Family Social Work, 34, 40, 111
American Child Hygiene Association, 32, 51
American Prison Association, 33
American Red Cross, 23, 32, 34–6, 53, 116
Apprenticeship, 21, 25, 138
Ashley, W. J., 183

Barnett, Canon, 132–3
Begging, 168–171, 183, 221–6, 237, 259
Benedict, 235
Binet-Simon tests, 157–8
Blind, 155, 261
Bolt, Dr. Richard A., 32
Bosanquet, Bernard, 204
Boston, 22, 53, 110, 115, 135, 152
Bourgeoisie, 79–82, 101, 120–123, 130–1, 201
Buffalo, 110–111

Cabot, Dr. R. C., 115
California, 37, 45–6, 56
Case conference, 113
Case method, 114–7
Catholic Church, 23, 152, 177, 215 ff., 230 ff., see also National Catholic Welfare Council
Catholic Protectory, 152
Central registration, 112
Chambers of Commerce, 39, 125, 281
Charities endorsement committees, 39–40
Charity, 61–4, 226–8, 320
Charity organization movement, 103 ff.
Charlemagne, 238, 239
Child Labor, 158–160
Child-placing, 148–150, 196
Child Welfare, 37, 51–2, 53–4, 145 ff., 195–6, 233, 238, 262
Children's Bureau, 51, 67, 161
Chrysostom, 218–220
Church Fathers, 217–220
Chicago, 22, 39, 115, 134
Chicago, University of, 22
Cities, growth of, 77
City planning, 127
Cleveland, 43–44
Coit, Stanton, 134
College settlement, 134–5
Conant Thread Co., 96
Confidential exchange, 112
Confraternities, 288–290
Constantine, 234
Constructive work, 68–9
Cooley, Chas. H., 68, 308
Coöperative Education Association of Virginia, 32
Coöperative movement, 57–9, 69
Correlation of social agencies, 31 ff., 112, 161
Councils of social agencies, 40–42

County children's homes, 150
Craft gilds, 283–288
Credit, 59, 243–4
Crusades, 240

Deaf, 155, 261
Definition of social work, 17–9, 28
Delinquents, work with, 115, 154–155
Democracy, 26–7, 56, 63, 64–5, 88, 90, 101, 142, 196–7, 200–2, 226–8, 321–2
Denison, Edward, 132
Domestic system of industry, 75, 78–9, 172–4
Disorganization, see Social disorganization
Dunning, Ralph, 187

Education, 52, 59–61, 69, 98–9, 137, 160, see also Training for social work
Elberfeld, 103–6
Employers' liability, 55
Employers' welfare work, see Industrial welfare work
Enclosures of farm land, 174–6
Endorsement of charities, 38–40
England, 76–7, 131–3, 158, 165 ff., 220, 222–4, 250 ff., 297, 299, 302

Farming-out the poor, 190
Federal departments, 51, 53, 97
Federation of woman's clubs, 32
Federations of social agencies, 42–5
Feebleminded, 155–8, 195–6
Feudalism, 171–7, 234–5, 236
Financial federations, 42–5
France, 155–6, 170, 222, 260, 300–1, 302
Fresno County, California, 45–6
Frey, John P., 101
Friendly visitors, 113

George Junior Republic, 152–3
Germany, 103–6, 293, 296–7
Gilds, 281 ff., 293–5
Girard College, 147
Gompers, Samuel, 100
Great Britain, 56, 58, 91–4, 159, 165 ff., see also England
Gregory the Great, 235–6

Hamburg-Elberfeld system, 103–6
Handicapped children, 155–8
Hart, Hastings H., 146, 153
Health, 97, 237–8, see also Public health work
Henry Street Settlement, 136
Hill, Octavia, 121, 123, 124–5
Home-finding, 148–150
Hospitality, 232–3
Hospital orders, 242–3
Hospital social work, 115–6
Hospitals, medieval, 249 ff., 299–301
Housing reform, 119 ff., 184–5
Houston, Texas, 45
Howe, Samuel G., 156–7
Hull House, 134
Humane societies, 149
Humanitarianism, 75, 86–8, 120–3, 130–1

Illinois Children's Home and Aid Society, 149

Illinois Steel Co., 96
Industrial Revolution, 75 ff.
Industrial schools for wayward children, 152, 153
Industrial welfare work, 90 ff.
Insane, 171, 195–6, 260–1
Institutions, see Hospitals, Orphanages, Industrial schools, Workhouses, Xenodochia, etc.
Institutional churches, 136
Insurance, see Social insurance
Intercollegiate Community Service Association, 135
Iowa, 46
Italy, 292, 300–1

Jewish social work, 43
Juvenile courts, 154–5

Kansas City Board of Public Welfare, 47

Labor colleges, 139
Labor legislation, 53–6, 69
Laissez-faire, 81
Lamprecht, Karl, 10
Legislation, 38–9, 53–6, 56–7, 125–7, 154–5, 159–160, 161, 183 ff.
Limited dividend housing companies, 124
London, 106–9, 119, 120–1
Los Angeles, 38–9
Ludlow Manufacturing Associates, 95–6

McLean, Francis H., 41
Manor, 272–276
Massachusetts, 151, 153, 154
Mead, Geo. H., 68, 308
Medical social work, 115–6
Medieval philosophy, 239–240
Mental defectives, 155–8
Merchant gilds, 281–3
Michigan, 150
Middle class, see Bourgeoisie
Ministry of Labour, 206–7
Mobility, 85, 166, 188–9, 195, 268–272
Modern Health Crusaders, 32, 51
Monasteries, 177–9, 235, 237, 241–242
Mont-de-Piété, 243–4
More, Sir Thomas, 176
Mothers' pensions, 151
Motives, 50, 86–8, 113, 120–3, 130–1, 136, 145, 189, 215 ff., 235–6, 239–240, 245–7, 252–6, 258–9, 275–6, 288–9
Municipal departments, 38–9, 47
Municipal granaries, 298–9
Mutual aid, 275–9, 282, 286–290

National Catholic Welfare Council, 23
National Child Labor Committee, 159
National Committee for Mental Hygiene, 52–3
National Conference of Social Work, 33, 114
National Investigation Bureau, 40
National Organization for Public Health Nursing, 36
National organizations, 32 ff.
National Service School for Women, 247
National Tuberculosis Association, 32, 36, 51
Nationalism, 170, 179–180
Neighbourhood Guild, 134
New Testament, 217

New York Children's Aid Society, 148
New York City, 21, 109, 119, 121–3, 125, 134, 135, 136, 152
New York Orphanage, 147
New York School of Social Work, 21
New York Society for the Prevention of cruelty to children, 149–150
N. O. Nelson Co., 94–5
North Carolina, 46–7

Ohio, 115, 150, 153
Old Age Pensions, 207–8
Old Testament, 216
Oregon, 54
Orphanages, 145–7, 150
Owen, Robert, 58, 92

Papal indulgences, 220–1
Parish, 183 ff., 276–8
Parole, 153–4
Peacedale Mfg. Co., 94, 96–7
Pensions, 99–100, 151, 207–8
Persecutions, 230–4
Philadelphia, 110, 111, 115, 147, 152
Philanthropic Trust Funds, 123
Primary group life, 230–4, 267, 268 ff., 278–9, 283–6, 312–5
Probation, 154
Professional training, 19–24
Proletariat, 79–80, 82–4
Protestant Reformation, 180–1, 245–7
Public health work, 36, 50–3, 161
Public welfare, Boards of, 47

Recreation, 98, 137
Red Cross, see American Red Cross
Relation of Social work to other vocations, 17–8, 19–20, 24, 28–9
Religious gilds, 288–290
Religious merit of almsgiving, 215 ff., 252–4, 288–290, 316–7
Repressive measures, 168–170, 183–4, 295–8
Richmond, Mary E., 111
Robinson, James Harvey, 9
Russell Sage Foundation, 40, 111, 116

St. Louis, 40, 41
School hygiene, 52
Science, 65–8, see also Social science
Seignobos, Charles, 10
Serfdom, 234–5
Settlement Acts, 188, 195
Settlements, 130 ff.
Simmons College School of Social Work, 22
Social centres, 139–140
Social disorganization the occasion for social work, 18, 28, 84–6, 131, 145, 165–181, 200, 232, 236, 240–1, 315–320
Social insurance, 56–7, 208–211
Social science, 25–8, 67–8, 116–7
Social unit, 140–2
Socialism, 65, 83–4, 132, 201
Societies for prevention of cruelty to children, 149–150
South End House, 135
Spain, 155, 169–170, 260, 261
State conferences, 34
State departments, 32, 36–8

State schools for needy children, 150–1
Supervision of private agencies, 257
Switzerland, 295–6

Tasks of social work, 84–6
Tendencies in social work summarized, 10, 29, 31, 48, 50, 68–9, 90–1, 103, 117, 128, 143, 158, 161, 165–6, 197–8, 262–3, 307–8, 321–2
Thomas, W. I., 68, 117
Towns, medieval, 292 ff.
Trade unionism, 64–5, 83, 100–1, 201–2
Training for social work, 20–4, 138, 247
Transportation agreement, 114
Toynbee, Arnold, 133

University extension, 138
University Settlement, 134

Vagrants, 196
Vincent de Paul, 247
Virginia, 32, 42
Vivès, Juan Louis, 303–4
Vocational guidance, 59, 116
Völkerwanderung, 234, 236

Wage subsidies, 191–2
Wald, Lilian D., 136
Waltham Watch Co., 94
War chests, 44–5
War Risk Insurance, 57
Wayward children, 151–5
Webb, Sidney and Beatrice, 195, 197–8, 204–5, 210
Widows' pensions, 151
Woods, Robert A., 135
Workers in training, 21
Workhouse, 189

Xenodochium, 235, 238, 249

Young Men's Christian Association, 32
Young Women's Christian Association, 32
Ypres, 303–4

Zoning, 128